MYTHICAL AND LEGENDARY NARRATIVE IN OVID'S *FASTI*

MNEMOSYNE

BIBLIOTHECA CLASSICA BATAVA

COLLEGERUNT
H. PINKSTER • H.S. VERSNEL
I.J.F. DE JONG • P.H. SCHRIJVERS
BIBLIOTHECAE FASCICULOS EDENDOS CURAVIT
H. PINKSTER, KLASSIEK SEMINARIUM, SPUISTRAAT 134, AMSTERDAM

SUPPLEMENTUM DUCENTESIMUM SEXAGESIMUM TERTIUM

PAUL MURGATROYD

MYTHICAL AND LEGENDARY NARRATIVE IN OVID'S *FASTI*

MYTHICAL AND LEGENDARY NARRATIVE IN OVID'S *FASTI*

BY

PAUL MURGATROYD

BRILL
LEIDEN · BOSTON
2005

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

A C.I.P. record for this book is available from the Library of Congress.

ISSN 0169-8958
ISBN 90 04 14320 3

© Copyright 2005 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands
Koninklijke Brill NV incorporates the imprints Brill Academic Publishers,
Martinus Nijhoff Publishers and VSP.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Brill provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910 Danvers, MA 01923, USA. Fees are subject to change.

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

OPTIMAE MATRI

Gladys Audrey Murgatroyd
1924–2001

CONTENTS

Preface xi

Chapter One Introduction 1
  Description 3
  Space 6
  Placement 9
  Cinematic Techniques 14
  Time 18
  Rapidity 23

Chapter Two Other Voices 27
  General Context 30
  1.259ff. (Janus) 32
  1.469ff. (Carmentis) 34
  1.543ff. (Carmentis) 36
  3.179ff. (Mars) 37
  3.277ff. (Egeria) 39
  4.197ff. (Erato) 41
  4.223ff. (Erato) 42
  4.249ff. (Erato) 43
  4.809ff. (Quirinus) 44
  5.11ff. (Polyhymnia) 46
  5.81ff. (Calliope) 47
  5.195ff. (Flora) 49
  5.231ff. (Flora) 51
  5.451ff. (Mercury) 52
  5.639ff. (Tiber) 55
  5.699ff. (Mercury) 56
  6.485ff. (Bacchus) 57
  6.657ff. (Minerva) 59
  6.697ff. (Minerva) 61

Chapter Three Rape Narratives 63
  A Feminist Approach 64
  A Narratological Approach 66

Polytonality 74
Rape as Challenge 81
Rape and Doctrina 88
Rape as Subversion 91
Rapes and Love Poetry 94

Chapter Four Ovid and Virgil 97
Techniques in Isolation 99
Apposite Associations 100
Elevation 100
Foreshadowing 102
Reader Deception 103
Oppositio in Imitando and *Variatio* 105
Aemulatio 107
Polemical Engagement 109
Parody 111
Simultaneous Virgilian Allusion 113
Contaminatio 116
Interfigurality 119
Episodes 126
Techniques in Combination 133

Chapter Five Characters 141
Economy 142
New/Rare Prominence 144
Recurring Characters 147
Greimas' Actant Model 151
Minimized and Elided Characters 156
Minor Characters 159
Developed Characters 163

Chapter Six Ovid and Livy 171
Part 1: The General Picture 172
  Nature of the World Depicted 172
  Approach and Usage 173
  Methods of Narration 176
Part 2: Individual Narratives 180
  The Fabii 181
  Gabii 187
  Lucretia 191
  Tullia 201

Chapter Seven Aperture 207
Aperture Prior to the Narratives 208
Aperture in the Narratives Themselves: General Characteristics 210
Four Main Types of Openings 214
Colouring 219
The Narrative Hook 222
Mood 225
Having Fun with the Reader 227

Chapter Eight Ovid and Ovid 235
Doublets in the *Fasti* and *Metamorphoses* 235
Internal Self-Reference 252
Reprise of an Incident 253
Segmented Narration 255
Redeployment of Phraseology 258
Multiple Allusion 263

Chapter Nine Closure 269
A Standard Ending 270
Standard Features 273
A Deviant Ending 278
Deviations 282

Select Bibliography 289
General Index 295
Index of Ovidian Lines Discussed 298

PREFACE

A recent spate of scholarship on the *Fasti* has covered various important aspects of this multifaceted work (religious, historical, political, astronomical, generic etc.), but as yet nobody has really analysed the mythical and legendary narratives as narrative, even though they make up almost half of the poem and are also of obvious importance. This book attempts to fill that gap, combining traditional tools of literary criticism with more modern techniques (taken especially from narratology and intertextuality). This is, of course, just one way of looking at the narratives, but it is a valid one, which I trust will make for enlightenment and balance (filling out the picture and helping these stories to come alive). When I looked at these passages I did bear in mind other considerations (cultural, generic, ideological and so on); but in an already lengthy book there simply was not the room to dilate on these elements (which have in any case already been studied in detail by others).

To keep my discussions accessible, I use as little jargon as possible and explain what will for many be unfamiliar terms and theories where they have to be employed. I have also put shorter treatments of less complex topics in the first chapter to act as an appetizer. There is just not the space for me to theorize or argue for my critical positions either, so I simply refer to those who have most influenced my thinking and hope that the usefulness of my approach will be self-evident. There seemed to be more of a need for me to put across my actual findings and try to elucidate these largely ignored accounts, so the stress is on practical rather than theoretical criticism. As there was so much work remaining to be done in the area of appreciation, I have had to pack in my analyses and observations quite densely. To cut down on unnecessary clutter, and contrary to the growing trend of submerging Ovid under an indiscriminate mass of bibliographical references, I cite scholarship only where it has a direct and important bearing on what I say (and not that many critics have tackled the passages from my angle). Where I see point in discrepancies, contradictions and inversions within the poem, I allow that Ovid intended them (rather than taking the view that they were accidental and clumsy slips which should have been corrected in a final revision). Other students of the *Fasti* see a more sober and solemn Ovid than I do. I can't help that. And I feel that they actually miss much. It is true that in this poem Ovid is often serious. But in these narratives in particular for me the Ovid here has the same kind of style, verve, wit and humour that we find in the *Amores, Heroides, Ars Amatoria, Remedia* and *Metamorphoses*; and I highlight those elements in this poem because they have been largely neglected so far. Perhaps in the present academic climate I should also point out that I personally do not approve of rape or the depiction of women in an unfavourable light, but I do believe that a scholar should address all aspects of Ovid's work and do so in an objective spirit.

The text used (with some reservations) is the Teubner by Alton, Wormell and Courtney. My translations are meant to be accurate without being stilted and have no pretensions to elegance. The book is aimed at university lecturers, graduate and senior undergraduate students; I assume familiarity with Classical culture in general but not with the (numerous and neglected) particular versions of myths and legends in the poem (which I summarize where necessary). My remarks are, of course, directed at the *Fasti* in particular, but should also be of relevance to Ovidian narrative in general (especially the *Metamorphoses*). The presentation of research on such a large and varied corpus of tales is a complex and problematical business. I could have written a work in which I simply produced a full critical appreciation of passage after passage; but this would have involved massive repetition and would not have provided the overviews and analytical sharpness achieved by the format which I have adopted. Given the nature of this book (whereby I return to accounts, sometimes again and again, to study them from different angles), a certain amount of repetition is still unavoidable. But this does facilitate the persusal of individual chapters in isolation and browsing. I use lots of cross-references in the chapters, and the indices are also a good way of bringing together my various comments on the different narratives.

There remains the pleasant duty of recording my thanks. I was very fortunate to be able to draw on the fine scholarship of three good friends—Elaine Fantham, Jim Butrica and Jim McKeown. They very generously scrutinized every chapter at a time when they were busy themselves, gave me much encouragement and offered lots of useful comments. Alison Keith kindly looked through the feminist section of the chapter on rape narratives and was helpful with bibliography in particular (but should not be held responsible for the views expressed there). Two graduate students (Brad Johnson and Robert Nau) saved me many hours by doing valuable bibliographical searches for me. I would also like to thank Brill's anonymous referee for stimulating criticism of the penultimate draft. None of the above, of course, is responsible for any errors or infelicities in this book.

P.M.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

This chapter will begin with an overview (definition, some facts and figures, and general characteristics of the passages under consideration) and will then move on to aspects which are important but do not merit a whole chapter each to themselves.

In this book by 'narrative' I mean simply a story as related by a story-teller, i.e. a passage in which an agent (the poet or a character in the poem) provides an account of one or more events. The narratives studied here are the versions in the *Fasti* of the myths and legends (i.e. myths with a strong historical basis) connected with Greece and the prehistory, origins and early years of Rome (a few tales of later times are also included where there is obvious mythological colouring).[1] This excludes mere allusions and brief references, but there are still problems over the lower limit (i.e. how few lines can still be counted as a narrative). To provide myself with a manageable corpus and accounts of some substance which can be usefully analysed, I have restricted my research to passages of more than ten lines.

With this working definition I noted narratives at the following places in the poem: 1.259–76, 363–80, 393–440, 469–542, 543–584; 2.83–118, 155–92, 195–242, 247–66, 305–56, 361–78, 383–422, 429–48, 459–74, 481–512, 585–616, 687–710, 711–852; 3.11–48, 49–78, 179–228, 277–392, 461–516, 545–656, 663–74, 677–94, 737–60, 795–808, 853–76; 4.197–212, 223–42, 249–348, 419–618, 641–72, 809–58, 879–98; 5.11–48, 81–106, 115–28, 169–82, 195–214, 231–60, 381–414, 451–80, 495–544, 605–18, 639–60, 699–720; 6.105–30, 131–68, 321–44, 351–94, 419–54, 485–550, 587–620, 657–92, 697–708 and 737–62. I do not count as part of the narrative transitional or introductory remarks by the poet (as at 1.257f., 1.391f.). Some might view the account of the fire in Vesta's temple as beginning at 6.437 rather than 6.419; some might dispute that the tale of the rape of Flora ends at 5.214;[2] and some might see just one narrative each time where I (for reasons that will become clear later in this book) see two separate ones at 1.469ff. and 543ff.; 2.687ff. and 711ff.; 3.11ff. and 49ff.; and 6.105ff. and 131ff. At any rate on my count there are 58 of these tales in the surviving six books of the *Fasti* (five in book I; thirteen in II; eleven in III; seven in IV; twelve in V; and ten in VI), and they take up 2,318 lines out of a total of 4,972 (i.e. 46.6% of the poem).

---

[1] As there is at 2.195ff. (the Fabii), 4.249ff. (Cybele brought to Rome), 6.351ff. (the Gauls' siege of Rome) and 6.419ff. (fire in Vesta's temple).

Such narrative was firmly in the tradition of major models for the *Fasti* (especially Callimachus' *Aetia*, Propertius book 4 and didactic such as Aratus' *Phaenomena*) and was variously employed by Ovid. Primarily illustrative and explanatory, it is used to provide a range of *aetia* (for cult, constellations, nomenclature, customs etc.) and in particular to build up an illustration or explanation or to privilege it over others, to diversify and embellish what some would find rather dry material in the main body of the poem, and to bring life and interest to a star, practice, rite etc. by giving it a human face, making it distinctive and memorable and so on. These are (usually brief) elucidations and decorations within the body of the poem in which Ovid skims and highlights as suits his particular purposes (rather than telling the whole story in regular proportions for its own sake), and as such they are more closely related to the digressions in the *Ars Amatoria* and *Remedia* than they are to the full blown narrative in the *Metamorphoses* that forms all of the poem.[3]

The *Fasti* does represent a higher form of elegy,[4] but by means of these passages especially Ovid helps ensure that the poem still has a broad appeal thanks to their subject matter and his handling of it. He chooses for inclusion stories which are informative, interesting, recondite, novel, quaint, moving, erotic, sensational etc. These are for the most part short and snappy accounts, with something of a scattershot effect (if you are not particularly taken by one of them, it is quickly over and another one which might appeal more soon comes along). There is much wit and humour (often irreverent), there are graphic touches and lively turns (like addresses, exclamations, asides, questions), and there is constant variety (in mood, length, tone, generic flavour etc.), as Ovid evinces an entertaining versatility and unpredictability. Imaginative and inventive, he injects new life into old anecdotes again and again with versions which are erudite, clever and complex, which have subtle point and which are boldly experimental (taking risks by putting them in the mouths of inadequate and annoying narrators and so forth). There is the technical finish too (stylistic polish, elegant structure, considered placement). Above all Ovid is a story-teller at the height of his powers, dexterously utilizing a wide range of narrative techniques (e.g. in connection with characterization, aperture, closure and reader deception), and he is a learned poet repeatedly engaging with other narratives (especially by Virgil, Livy and himself), modifying, inverting, correcting, topping etc. Taken as a whole these passages amount to a tour-de-force in instruction by a writer who is clearly testing, parading and revelling in his own scholarship and ingenuity. Of course, much of this is just typical of Ovid, but the fact remains that as yet many of these essentially Ovidian characteristics in the *Fasti* narratives have not been properly recognized or analysed. It is hoped that what follows in this book will do something to remedy that state of affairs.

---

[2] There seems to be a deliberate blurring of the end as the enthusiastic chatterbox Flora runs on here.

[3] Cf. ZINN 69 and 71.

[4] See 2.3ff., *Tr.* 2.547ff.

Description

These Ovidian accounts naturally include description of characters, places and things among the events recounted, to flesh the story out, and to add concrete detail,[5] life, clarity, vividness and so on. Full portrayal of the appearance of people, locations and objects is used sparingly, but when it is used it is functional and has impact (not least because it is uncommon and so attracts attention and makes it clear that what is being described is important). Relying often on readers' existing knowledge of the tales that Ovid tells, this paucity contributes to the spare and lean quality of these generally streamlined narratives. Most description is brief and conveyed by means of a single epithet; sometimes we find a phrase or clause occupying up to a line of verse; in 2,318 lines of narrative there are only 25 examples[6] of lengthier depiction than that. Of those 25 instances there are only six that extend beyond a couplet (1.551ff., 3.295ff., 4.419ff., 427ff., 5.117ff., 6.131ff.),[7] and the first four of them occur in lengthy accounts. Description occupying more than one line is especially common of places which are scenes of momentous action, but is also employed to highlight characters of consequence (such as Cacus, the goat that suckled Jupiter, and the screech-owls at 1.551ff., 5.117ff. and 6.131ff.).

---

[5] So Ovid does sometimes go in for the effet de réel (on which see Barthes in TODOROV 11ff.), reporting a detail which has no significant function in the narrative and is simply part of the reality presented, like the splashing of the ship at 2.112. On description see Hamon in TODOROV 147ff., and BAL 129ff.

Just a couplet of such description in the economical Ovid's hands can be effective, as 5.381f. shows. There Ovid portays the home of Chiron, who was rearing the young Achilles ('Pelion is a Thessalian mountain that faces south; its top is green with pine, the rest of it is covered by oaks'). Ovid then goes on to relate how Hercules turned up, and Chiron, while inspecting his poisoned arrows, dropped one on his foot and died, to the great grief of Hercules and especially Achilles. The place depicted is doubly significant (there Chiron meets his end, and extraordinarily[8] two mighty heroes who were the bane of Troy come into contact). The duality of types of tree cleverly suits the hybrid Centaur (and fits with the heroic pair present there). Especially noteworthy is the gloomy aspect: the heavily wooded mountain is aptly dark (and Chiron's cave on it, mentioned in 383f., would be still darker), making for a sombre start to a sombre tale;[9] the stress on wood looks forward to Hercules' fatal arrows; and oak and pine were used in funeral pyres.[10]

Longer description has even more impact, as is shown by 6.131ff.,[11] on the screech-owls that viciously attacked the infant Proca, until Cranae drove them away:

---

[6] At 1.551ff., 2.165f., 215f., 315f., 435f., 465f., 703f., 3.295ff., 567f., 581f., 667f., 799f., 4.419ff., 427ff., 491f., 495f., 649f., 881f., 5.93f., 117ff., 209f., 381f., 639f., 6.131ff., 495f. Cf. also 2.763ff.

[7] Cf. HEINZE 342f. on delineation of place usually taking up no more than a distich in the *Fasti* (as opposed to the *Metamorphoses*), although his list of such descriptions is incomplete.

[8] See p. 144.

[9] And heightening the brilliance of the stars at the end (5.414).

[10] Cf. e.g. Enn. *Ann.* 175ff., Virg. *Aen.* 6.180f., 11.136f., Sil. It. 10.530ff. For a similarly successful single couplet of description see pp. 189f. Of course, you can never be sure with Ovid, and so (unlike here) the sombre grove at 3.295ff. is in fact preamble to humour (see pp. 138ff.).

[11] Cf. also pp. 107f., 217ff.

sunt avidae volucres, non quae Phineia mensis
 guttura fraudabant, sed genus inde trahunt:
grande caput, stantes oculi, rostra apta rapinis;
 canities pennis, unguibus hamus inest;
nocte volant puerosque petunt nutricis egentes, 135
 et vitiant cunis corpora rapta suis;
carpere dicuntur lactentia viscera rostris,
 et plenum poto sanguine guttur habent.
est illis strigibus nomen; sed nominis huius
 causa quod horrenda stridere nocte solent. 140

> There are voracious birds—not the ones that cheated Phineus' throat of food, but they are descended from those. They have large heads, goggling eyes, beaks made for rapine, grey in their feathers and hooks on their claws. They fly at night and attack children without a nurse, snatching them from their cradles and mutilating their bodies. It is said that they tear at the flesh of unweaned babies with their beaks and drink down the blood until their gullets are full. They are called screech-owls—so called because of their habit of screeching horribly at night.

Attention is really focused on the screech-owls by means of the description's length and comprehensiveness (covering origins, appearance, activities and derivation of name) and also by means of all the sensational details, the rarity of references to such vampire-like creatures in earlier and contemporary literature[12] and the abrupt switch here to a brand new story about Cranae (from the light-hearted version of Janus' rape of her at 6.105ff. just before this). These lines suddenly change the mood, from frivolity to foreboding, and provide an arresting start to Proca's story. They build up the screech-owls as real villains (so that we feel sympathy for Proca and admiration for Cranae, rejoicing to see the creatures thwarted). The lines also establish this passage as a horror story quickly and compellingly, thanks to a whole host of effects—the collocation of so many lurid features; the staccato short phrases at 133f.; the ghastly chiasmus in 134; grim tricolon crescendo (at 133 and at 135f.); frequent emphatic placement; dramatic and vehement alliteration throughout and sinister sigmatism in 139f.; powerful language (with impact firstly from epithets in 131 and 133, then from nouns in 133f., then from verbs in 135–7, and with repetition of the emotive words *nox, rostrum* and *rapina/rapio*); and the overall ordering (2 frightening lines on the birds' physical appearance (133f.) are followed by 4 even more frightening lines on their vampiric activities (135–8), and that six line group is framed by mythological allusion linking the screech-owls with the fearsome Harpies in 131f. and the dread Hydra with its multiple biting heads in 140).[13]

---

[12] Cf. BÖMER II 344.

Space

Although Ovid probably did not think of space (and movement through it) in quite the same analytical fashion that narratologists do,[14] he still exploited it in interesting ways.

The amount of space occupied is often of significance. For example, when Dido's sister Anna flees from Carthage, she first takes refuge on Malta, which is delineated as a small island in the Libyan sea, lashed by its waves (3.567f., 572). This speck in the midst of the vast expanse of water seems paltry and insignificant, a vulnerable refuge surrounded by violence and menace (and the waves prefigure her brother Pygmalion, who comes after her from the sea, is even fiercer than it (3.580) and cannot be withstood on Malta). At 5.495ff. there is stress on lowness and smallness[15] in connection with Hyrieus' space (his tiny hut), which underlines his humility and poverty and makes the hospitality that he shows to the gods seem even greater. It's all rather circumscribed, and that increases the force of 537ff., where the son (Orion) created for him by the grateful gods turns out to be a giant, escapes those cramped confines as Diana's attendant and is raised as high as the stars. When space is opened out, it can be filled to great effect. So at 4.641–8 there is a whole landscape of devastation. All the space described is replete with failure of crops and death of livestock, and there is powerful collocation of various forms of destruction and contrast with the fertility in 632f. and bumper crops in 617f. All of this intensifies the sense of relief and gratitude when the disaster is averted at 671f.

With regard to movement, sometimes space cannot/should not be traversed (so there are barriers and boundaries at 1.265ff., 4.837ff. and 6.155ff.), while an unrestricted advance across space can mark out mighty heroes like Hercules (who makes his way across the world at 1.544) and heroic types[16] like the Fabii (whose wide-ranging motion shows vigour and dash at 2.195ff.). There are even whole narratives of movement (passages in which it figures constantly and is of primary importance). In particular at 4.249ff. there is Cybele's long journey to Rome (an epic voyage like Aeneas'),[17] where there is a miraculous aspect to the motion (at 269f. and 327), and various halts make it seem longer and sometimes heighten the wonder (at 267ff. and 325ff.). And 4.419ff. are largely taken up with Ceres' search for her abducted daughter Persephone, as she wanders far and wide on earth, and even up to heaven. There lists of places visited and (by contrast) the still centre provided by the Celeus episode (at 507ff.) underscore the extent of movement, which brings out how distraught and determined Ceres is and also has its lighter side (as the frantic Ceres rushes around not realizing that her daughter is beneath her feet, in the Underworld, all along).[18]

---

[13] See pp. 100f.

[14] Especially stimulating in this connection are STRELKE 179ff., ANDERSSON passim, CHATMAN 96ff., PRINCE 32f. and BAL 93ff.

[15] See 499f., 506–9 and 520.

Often both space and motion through it are of consequence within the same narrative. At 3.29ff. Rhea Silvia (after being raped by Mars while she slept) relates the dream she has just had: the headband slipped from her hair in front of the sacred hearth and two palm trees grew together from it; one of them was greater, covering the whole world with its branches and touching the stars with its foliage; suddenly her uncle Amulius swung an axe at the trees, which were saved by a woodpecker and a she-wolf fighting in their defence. There is marvel and obvious symbolism in the springing up of the trees (with a fall paradoxically resulting in a rise) and in the space filled by one of them (whose massiveness and miraculous ascent is stressed by contrast with the normal trees and movement (especially downward) in the preceding lines).[19] The Romulus palm with its enormous extent is visually staggering and an extraordinary image (of eminence, dominance, contact with heaven etc.). The flurry of movement at the base of the trees directs further attention to them, and Amulius down there pales into insignificance,[20] someone whose movements (horizontal, not vertical) are hampered and ineffectual.

---

[16] Cf. pp. 185f.

[17] See p. 44.

[18] Pp. 80f.

[19] There is also humour, as Rhea Silvia does not have a clue about the purport of all this. So too with a droll coincidence she rises and while resting against a tree under shade and amid birds (3.17, 25f.) she tells of a dream in which she saw palm trees rise (one of which covers the earth) and be defended by a bird.

At 3.215ff. (for text and translation see pp. 38f.) there are lines and patterns within space. After the rape of the Sabine women the Roman and Sabine forces face each other and the women in mourning attire come between them to establish peace. The parallel lines of the two armies are a visual sign of their division and antagonism and make for tension (as they are ready to clash). The bellicose males bearing weapons and arrayed for war provide a frame for and put the focus on the pacific females bearing their children and arrayed for a funeral. From being peripheral the women (and children) advance into a position of central importance, and their occupation of mid-space, as well as acting as a barrier and a physical expression of their opposition to the fighting, is apt for characters who are connected with both groups of men and do not side with either army. At 226ff. the armies' lines converge, not in battle but as friends and relatives coming together, and the movement depicts reconciliation and foreshadows the subsequent merging of the two peoples.[21]

At 2.305ff. Faunus on a high hill sees Hercules and Omphale walking below and declares that she will be his love. The pair below make their way to a cavern, where they exchange clothes, dine and retire to bed. In the middle of the night Faunus enters the cave, blunders around in the dark, recoils from Hercules' lionskin (worn by Omphale), climbs into bed with Hercules (misled by his female attire) and tries to rape him, only to be pushed out on to the ground. Servants with lights are summoned, and all look down with amusement at the groaning deity. At the start the god in the open up on the hill is at a distance from and superior to the pair of lovers, and his lofty position suggests soaring thoughts and vaulting ambition. Then he makes his way to the enclosed cavern, becoming part of their world and getting on their level (when he leaves the heights and gets into bed with Hercules). Faunus ends up on the floor, lower than Hercules and Omphale, and demeaned by a literal and metaphorical fall. There is extensive and pointed inversion (with binary opposition—high/low, far/near, open/closed), and Faunus' amorous gaze down at Hercules and Omphale at the start is picked up by their amused gaze down at him at the end. Successive lines of motion lead to the important cave,[22] and it seems apt as well as logical that the inferior deity comes to it second and brings up the rear. There is a brief pause in his movement (and a build up) as he reconnoitres at the entrance; then he goes in, and (after his direct and purposeful approach to the cavern) his progress becomes uncertain and confused; next a twofold advance and retreat (as he recoils from Omphale and is shoved away by Hercules) arouses and frustrates readers' expectations of some kind of sexual activity, reflecting Faunus' own experience. The cave's space is fittingly dark (with connotations of furtive love, blindness, grief and evil), and apart from the suggestive conjunction of the lovers' beds (in 328 and 343) it is hardly defined, which makes it unclear and mysterious to us, just as it was to Faunus. In addition, not only does it provide a scene for the action it also plays a part in the action (partly responsible for Faunus being deluded), and its enclosed and echoing nature would make the laughter at the god's expense louder and longer (and so more humiliating).

---

[20] Cf. the pecking order of gods on Olympus, Romans on the Capitol and Gauls below them (at 6.351ff.), and Tarquin and Tullia on high while Tullius is on the ground (at 6.597ff.).

[21] Word order reinforces this: at 3.215–7 the abducted women (*raptae*) are positioned between the battle lines (215) and their fathers and husbands (217), while at 226ff. the Sabine men (*soceri* in 226 and *avus* in 228) enfold the Romans, women and children in 226f. (with juxtaposition of fathers-in-law and sons-in-law in 226).

Placement

The placement of these accounts within the body of the poem is another aspect into which a lot of thought has gone. Variety is a keynote here. It is evident in the spread of these passages across the six extant books of the *Fasti*. Book I contains only five of them, and together they take up 200 out of its 724 lines (the smallest number of narratives and lines devoted to narrative in a book of the *Fasti*). Perhaps Ovid did not feel much of a need to insert versions of myths and legends to add variety and life etc. at such an early point in the poem. At any rate in II by way of contrast there are 13 of them and they occupy 530 out of 864 verses (the largest number of narratives and lines dedicated to them in a book). III for the first time has two lengthy accounts within a single book (116 and 112 lines at 3.277ff. and 545ff.). IV has the longest narrative in the whole poem

---

[22] Compare the series of movements to the protagonist Lucretia at 2.721ff.

(the rape of Persephone at 4.419ff.). After that Ovid abandons long ones,[23] and V has 9 passages of 30 lines or less (the most in any book), while VI has the shortest in the whole poem (12 verses at 6.697ff.).[24] Ovid also achieves variety in a change from the single, free-standing version (the most common) by means of grouped versions (pairs or trios in immediately or closely succeeding lines) and in the distribution of such groups across the books (I has one pair; II contains two pairs; in III there is one pair and one trio; IV has just one trio; there are no groups at all in V; VI contains two pairs).[25]

Inevitably such grouping creates patterns and is effective in various ways.[26] Often we find patterning and efficacious placement in connection with isolated accounts too. For instance, there is an obvious ring structure within the six books as the Vesta rape at 6.321ff. is so similar to the Lotis rape at 1.393ff.; and the abduction of Persephone at 4.469ff. forms an eye-catching centre-piece, set roughly in the middle of IV and flanked by three narratives on either side.[27] As for useful positioning, the influence of individual narratives on aperture and closure within books is especially noteworthy. At 5.11ff. Polyhymnia's amusing and inept explanation of the derivation of *Maius* ('May') makes for an engaging opening.[28] Ovid also rings the changes in connection with the diminuendo ending. At 2.711–852 (the very moving and shocking rape of Lucretia) the emotional pitch is screwed right up, only to be relaxed by the twelve lines that follow with their down to earth and rather mundane material. At 5.699ff. the final mythical account in the book is factual, detached and remote,[29] and its subdued nature is subsequently reinforced by the bitty and dry 721ff., so that it all forms part of the quiet conclusion. The story of Phrixus and Helle at 3.853ff. contains a diminuendo close itself: after all the hatred aroused for their stepmother (Ino, the wicked queen who tries to kill them) and pity for them and their father,[30] there is relief when the children finally escape (thanks to the intervention of their divine mother, who gives them a golden ram to transport them to Colchis), Helle after falling off the animal into the sea does not drown but enters on a union with a sea god, and Phrixus makes it safely to Colchis. That diminuendo within the narrative is picked up and continued by the low-key and somewhat pedestrian 877ff. That story in its late location is also employed to contribute to the sense of closure (in keeping with the completion of the month and the book): the tale reaches its natural and logical conclusion and duly delivers the *aetion* of the Ram promised at 3.852 (the golden ram is turned into this constellation at 3.875); there are various terminal motifs (e.g. the end of the children's journey and of the ram's existence on earth); and there is a ring within the narratives at the start and conclusion of III (elements of the birth of Romulus and Remus and their exposure at 3.11ff. and 49ff. are recalled here by the divine intervention, an attempt by royalty to kill two children foiled, a miraculous escape thanks to an animal, the two siblings separated, death in water avoided, and a heroine's union with a god).[31]

---

[23] Fifty lines on Orion at 5.495ff. and sixty-six on Ino at 6.485ff. are the most that we find.

[24] For such variety generally in the *Fasti* see BRAUN 2352ff.

[25] 1.469ff. and 543ff.; 2.305ff. and 361ff., 2.687ff. and 711ff.; 3.11ff. and 49ff., 3.545ff. and 663ff. and 677ff.; 4.197ff. and 223ff. and 249ff.; 6.105ff. and 131ff., 6.657ff. and 697ff. For more on such pairing in the *Fasti* see BRAUN 2355ff.

[26] See pp. 41ff., 59ff., 147ff., 229ff. and 278ff.

[27] See further below (on the ring in III) and cf. also pp. 252f. and BARSBY-BOOTH 28f.

[28] See pp. 46f. At 3.11ff. and 49ff. a pair of narratives get the book off to an entertaining and involving start (see pp. 69f., 71f., 91f. and 278ff.).

[29] See pp. 56f.

There are many more ways in which these isolated narratives are effectively positioned. Sometimes there appears to be a subtly subversive aspect. For instance, the comic story at 3.677ff. of Mars' futile attraction to Minerva and the trick played on him by Anna Perenna (who pretended to help him in his suit) seems to me to undermine the seriousness of the subsequent lines (3.697ff.) on the assassination of Julius Caesar.[32] Then again at 5.169ff. there is the affecting little tale of how the handsome and brave Hyas was killed (before he had had much of a life) and his death devastated his whole family, with his parents mourning the loss of their firstborn, and his sisters actually surpassing them in devotion to their big brother.[33] All of this heightens the impact of the humour in the anecdote about Flora that follows on shortly at 5.195ff.[34] At 1.393ff. there is extensive and ingenious playfulness. Ovid had just given his version of Aristaeus' loss of his bees at 1.363ff., where, after carefully suggesting an imminent description of his rape attempt on Eurydice in the grass near a river,[35] the poet in fact omits that incident entirely. At 1.395ff. Ovid builds up a heavily erotic aura in connection with the lecherous country gods and sexy nymphs at an outdoor festival of Bacchus, and it looks as if he is going to make up for that omission and with a typically clever variation move the al fresco sexual activity on grass by water to this the following narrative, but the group-sex fails to materialize.[36] But then at 415ff., as Priapus is attracted to Lotis and stalks her, it looks as if we will get copulation after all, only for his assault to be frustrated before it properly begins.[37] Placement can also elevate. At 2.361ff. we are given an unusual picture of Remus as the superior twin, when he is the one who recovers some cattle that robbers had stolen from them, and gets to speak (he is quoted, in 374, unlike Romulus in this passage), and is ruefully acknowledged as superior by Romulus at 377f. (with *Remumque* and *vincere* 'Remus' and 'to be victor' emphasized by being put at the end and start of the lines). This account comes shortly after Faunus' encounter with Hercules and Omphale at 2.305ff., and as a result Remus here surpasses not only Romulus but also the god, thanks to a series of contrasts (e.g. unlike the fearful Faunus wandering around in the dark cave, Remus is brisk, vigorous and fearless in his pursuit of the robbers; Remus also gets the prey that he goes after, foiling his opponents rather than being foiled himself; and at the end he speaks triumphantly instead of groaning in defeat).

---

[30] See p. 222.

[31] At the same time there is resumption and change (life is resumed by Helle as a nymph and by the ram as a constellation), which may just possibly prefigure the return to Ino with a different attitude to her at 6.485ff.

[32] Cf. NEWLANDS 60f. So too the praise of Augustus at 2.119ff. is problematized by the subsequent passage on the rape of Callisto (see p. 93); and a full 32 lines on Numa's great achievement at 4.641ff. seems to minimize somewhat the 4 lines that follow (rather like an afterthought) at 673ff. on Augustus getting the title of *imperator* (cf. BARCHIESI 1997 130ff.).

[33] Note also the sad inversion of *praeda benigna* (174) in *praeda cruenta* (178) as the hunter Hyas becomes prey himself, and in 179 the mournful assonance, alliteration and repetition of Hyas' name.

A final example also contains contrasts, but more elaborate antithesis in a diverting reprise. At 2.459ff. Ovid addresses the Fish constellation, explaining its origin:

---

[34] On the humour there see pp. 49ff.

[35] Cf. Virgil *G.* 4.457ff. and see pp. 227f.

[36] See pp. 226f.

[37] At the same time the attempt on Lotis is in fact a replacement for that on Eurydice, because it too takes place outdoors (on grass and near a river), is foiled by a creature (a snake kills Eurydice, and an ass wakes Lotis), and involves flight of the victim and death.

te memorant fratremque tuum (nam iuncta micatis
  signa) duos tergo sustinuisse deos. 460
terribilem quondam fugiens Typhona Dione,
  tum, cum pro caelo Iuppiter arma tulit,
venit ad Euphraten comitata Cupidine parvo,
  inque Palaestinae margine sedit aquae.
populus et cannae riparum summa tenebant, 465
  spemque dabant salices hos quoque posse tegi.
dum latet, insonuit vento nemus: illa timore
  pallet, et hostiles credit adesse manus,
utque sinu tenuit natum, 'succurrite, nymphae,
  et dis auxilium ferte duobus' ait. 470
nec mora, prosiluit. pisces subiere gemelli:
  pro quo nunc, cernis, sidera nomen habent.

> They say that you and your brother (for you sparkle side by side as stars) supported two gods on your backs. Once Venus, fleeing from terrible Typhon (at the time when Jupiter fought in defence of heaven), came to the Euphrates, accompanied by tiny Cupid, and sat down at the edge of that Palestinian river. Poplars and reeds occupied the top of the banks, and willows also offered hope that they could conceal themselves. While she was hiding, the wind made a loud noise in the trees; she went pale with fear and believed that her enemy's hands were nearly on her. Holding her son to her breast, she said, 'Come to the rescue, nymphs, and bring help to two gods!' She sprang forward without delay. Twin fish put themselves under her; in return for which (you see) they are now famous stars.

That quaint and amusing snippet is given some density and made still more entertaining by its location, because it clearly recapitulates the famous story of Arion which was told earlier in the same book (at 2.83ff.) to explain the origin of the Dolphin constellation. Here again we find an astronomical *aetion* in which there is a threat to the protagonist, who fearfully leaps into water and is miraculously saved by aquatic creatures, which take the protagonist on to their backs according to report[38] and which are stellified by way of reward. There are also differences, which underscore the loss of divine dignity. For example, unlike Arion, Venus hid, had no real reason for fear,[39] appealed for help and jumped in a panic. Also, in contradistinction to Arion on the dolphin's back, there is here the much more comic and bizarre picture of two gods (including large Venus) on much smaller (river) fish, surfing along without visible means of support, whether Cupid and Venus are on one fish each or (more likely in view of 469) she is still carrying him and has a foot on each of the two fish (which are engaged in synchronized swimming).

---

[38] Note *te/se memorant* 'they say that you/itself' and *tergo* 'back' in 2.114 and 459.

[39] She was frightened (without good cause) by the wind, whereas Arion only perhaps feared the wind (2.97), and not unreasonably, as he was sailing.

Cinematic Techniques

Cinema is, of course, just another form of narrative,[40] and various literary techniques can be grouped together under this heading, which usefully encourages awareness of their visual impact (something especially important in the case of Ovid, who was very fond of optical effects).[41] A good general example of the filmic quality of these accounts is provided by 1.363ff. (for text and translation see p. 134), which reads rather like a modern screenplay, leaving us to fill in the details and play a creative part in the narrative process. If we took Ovid's passage as instructions for shooting, we would make the following short film. After a dramatic and emotive opening shot of Aristaeus (in sharp focus) weeping (close-up on his face and tears), there is a brief and bleak flashback (screen filled with masses of dead bees and abandoned honeycombs). Return to Aristaeus, now with his mother, who is all blue (visually arresting) and who speaks (consoling him). Cut to Proteus, and zoom in on his aged arms, relaxed in sleep, and suddenly bound. The camera pulls back to reveal all of Proteus (now awake) and a rapid series of changes of shape (done with special effects), until he returns to his original form. Close-up on his dripping face with its blue beard, which directs attention to his words (the colour blue and speech are links between the two helpers). Cut to Aristaeus sacrificing, and then to the bullock's rotten carcase with bees swarming out of it in ever increasing numbers until they fill the screen (in contrast to the earlier shot of numerous dead bees). Specific cinematic procedures[42] are frequently evident in these versions of myths and legends, and what follows is just a representative selection.

---

[40] Cf. CHATMAN and WINKLER 193ff. on the similarities between narrative in literature and film.

[41] For analysis of cinematic procedures in Classical literature see LEGLISE, VIARRE 99ff., MALISSARD and WINKLER 219ff. In the discussion below I usually explain (or don't need to explain because it is obvious) how I perceive filmic techniques in the (similar but distinct) medium of literature. I should perhaps add here that (for example) at 1.375 when Ovid devotes a whole line to Proteus' face, and describes the lifting of it, the blueness of the beard and the moisture dripping from it, the face dominates, and I get a detailed view of it, just as in a close-up in cinema.

Ovid, like many directors, was generally sensitive to lighting and the mood created by brightness, darkness and chiaroscuro. In particular, we find a good example of 'low key' (which emphasizes shadows and pools of light to get an atmospheric feel) at 2.743, where Lucretia spins with her maids by a dim lamp while her husband is away at war. There the background blackness is apt for a wife in a gloomy state of mind and prey to sombre imaginings, and it encompasses her (foreshadowing the dark force Sextus and her death), while the light in which she spins makes her stand out, for impact on readers and on Sextus (who is thus attracted to her and later rapes her). 'Fade-out' is the slow fade of the picture from normal brightness to darkness and is often used to end a scene. Something similar to that happens at 3.48. where in Vesta's temple the fire (terrified by Rhea Silvia giving birth) sinks under its own ashes, making for a fittingly dismal and foreboding close to Ovid's tale of the rape of the Vestal.

Ovid's pacing sometimes recalls film too. There is (ominous and tense) slow motion at 4.297ff., where the ship bearing the statue of Cybele can hardly be dragged up the Tiber (just before its portentous grounding), and the dwelling on this for a full six lines (297–302) reinforces the retardation. Directors often slow the tempo prior to violent action. Similarly at 3.11ff. things slow down to the extent of Rhea Silvia falling asleep (18–20), before Mars' sudden rape of her in 21 (*Mars videt hanc visamque cupit potiturque cupita* 'Mars saw her and desired the one he saw and possessed the one desired'). There the seeing, desiring and raping occur so quickly within a single line that one is reminded of speeded up film. There is the same kind of accelerated motion at 4.445, where Dis abruptly abducts Persephone after a leisurely scene of flower-picking.

Camera position is important. So, for example, low angle shots (from below) are often utilized to make the person photographed seem imposing and dominant, while high angle shots (from above) can diminish characters, clarify patterns of movement etc. and are called

---

[42] For more on these techniques in film see GIANNETTI.

'godlike' when they are extremely high up (e.g. taken from a helicopter) and put viewers in a very superior location. On a few occasions Ovid invites his readers to situate themselves for a low or high angle shot. At 3.372f., as Numa's Romans raise their eyes to the sky, we are induced especially by *ecce* ('look') to do the same with them and to witness the miracle from their viewpoint, visualizing the shield sent by Jupiter swaying gently in the breeze and floating down to us from the yawning zenith of heaven (a dot at first, but gradually getting larger and becoming more distinct until it reaches earth in 375). At 3.863ff. the goddess Nephele, hovering in mid-air, observes her children (Phrixus and Helle) about to be sacrificed and, accompanied by clouds, dives down to the rescue and snatches them up. The verb *aspicit* 'she catches sight' [of the children] in particular encourages us to look down from her (godlike) position in the sky, so that we can identify with her and plunge down exhilaratingly and soar away triumphantly with her).[43]

Ovid is also adept at cutting. He likes the literary equivalent of the montage (a rapid succession of images or scenes depicting sequences of events). At 2.84ff. (for text and translation see p. 220) he has a series of shots showing the influence of Arion's marvellous music on water, various animals and birds and (by way of climax) the goddess Diana. Most of these are still pictures (which bring out the musician's calming effect), there are some extraordinary vignettes there (of dogs and hares taking the shade together, of lionesses and deer standing next to each other), and the various settings and individuals provide a great sweep to bring out Arion's powerful and pervasive impact in a dynamic and eye-catching way.[44] Ovid also cuts quickly between different characters within a single scene, as at 5.201f., where Flora wanders, Zephyrus catches sight of her, she moves off, he goes after her, she flees, he proves stronger. The alternation between victim and rapist is lively and dramatic and makes for a flurry of activity.[45] 'Jump-cut' is the name given to an abrupt transition between shots which has a startling or even disorienting effect, and which often omits chronologically intervening material. Ovid does something like that at 6.437f. when he moves suddenly from the Palladium at Troy

---

[43] So too at 6.351ff. it is easy to gaze down on Rome with the gods, and then with the Romans rain loaves down on the Gauls.

[44] There is also montage at 3.545ff., 4.278ff., 467ff., 561ff., 641ff. and 5.81ff.

[45] Cf. also 1.397ff., 3.330ff., 4.435ff., 5.699ff., 6.321ff., 485ff. and 697ff.

(and its removal to Rome, where it is kept in Vesta's temple) to the fire in that temple in 241 BC, thereby arresting the attention and arousing excitement.

We often find various cinematic techniques combined in one narrative. The story of Chiron's death after he dropped one of Hercules' arrows on to his foot begins (at 5.381ff.) as follows:

> Pelion Haemoniae mons est obversus in Austros:
>   summa virent pinu, cetera quercus habet.
> Phillyrides tenuit; saxo stant antra vetusto,
>   quae iustum memorant incoluisse senem.
> ille manus olim missuras Hectora leto 385
>   creditur in lyricis detinuisse modis.

> Pelion is a Thessalian mountain that faces south; its top is green with pine, the rest of it is covered by oaks. Philyra's son [Chiron] lived there. There stands a cave of ancient rock which they say the righteous old man inhabited. He is believed to have occupied with playing tunes on the lyre the hands that would one day send Hector to his death.

Ovid opens with something very like an 'establishing shot' (a long shot at the beginning of a scene to provide the viewer with context) and then zooms in on the important cave. Aptly it's all rather gloomy, so this is a tone-conscious start. Next, with a brief flashforward to the death of Hector, there is a close-up on Achilles' hands. He also zooms in later on these hands (famously described by Homer as 'man-slaying'),[46] at 395f., where Achilles cannot refrain from touching Hercules' lionskin (and they stand out via contrast in colour and texture), and at 409, where they repeatedly caress the sick Chiron's hands (a vivid visual representation of the closeness between tutor and pupil). The hands at this point in Achilles' career are engaged in activities quite different from killing, and the close-ups draw attention to the unusual slant that Ovid here gives to them, but they still represent a sombre motif: on top of the Homeric associations they are linked with death openly at 385 and more subtly at 395f. (the dead Nemean lion's skin) and 409 (the dying Chiron).[47] That last line in particular contains a striking image: as well as bringing out the pathos and showing Achilles' hands being tender to someone who he does *not* want to die, the repeated touching catches this very sad moment with something akin to the 'freeze-frame' (a shot composed of a single frame repeated on a filmstrip so that it gives the illusion of a still photograph). There is also powerful close-up at 397f. (on Hercules' arrows, and on one of them fixed in Chiron's foot), and that is followed at 399f. by Chiron groaning and pulling out the arrow and by Hercules and Achilles groaning—the literary equivalent of 'reaction shots' (which cut to a character's reaction) to build foreboding. I might add that while Ovid is fond of the zoom-in and the close-up,[48] he does also go in for the reverse of that process. 'Pull-back dolly' is the title for the technique whereby the camera moves back to reveal a person or thing previously out of frame, and Ovid does exactly that at 3.507f., where after keeping the focus on Ariadne complaining on the beach he suddenly pulls back to reveal that Bacchus had in fact been walking along behind her all the time, listening to her complaint.[49]

---

[46] At *Il.* 18.317, 23.18, 24.479. It may not be entirely coincidental that Ovid also refers to them three times here.

[47] Cf. p. 145 on the foreshadowing here.

Time

Ovid displays sensitivity to order, duration and frequency, the three aspects of temporality identified and analysed by narratologists.[50] To begin with the first of the three, events out of chronological order (anachronies) can occupy just a phrase or line or a whole passage, and they take the form of prolepsis (flashforward) and analepsis (flashback) covering a period of varying length in the far/middle/near future or past. Both occur often enough in these narratives, but (as is usual in the western tradition) analepsis is much more common. Ovid normally follows the chronological order of events in these stories and (unlike, for example, Catullus 64) he does not jump about much in time and does not go in for extended anachrony.[51]

---

[48] See also 1.415f., 2.611ff., 845f., 849, 3.181ff., 670, 4.240ff., 305ff., 442, 6.133f., 678.

[49] There is the same sort of stepping back at 2.489f. and 3.567f.

[50] On temporality in general see especially GENETTE 1972 77ff. and 1988 21ff., and also CHATMAN 62ff., RIMMON-KENAN 43ff., BAL 37ff., 51ff., TOOLAN 47ff., COHAN-SHIRES 84ff. and RICHARDSON 9ff. and 89ff. On Ovid's handling of time in the *Metamorphoses* see Rosati in BOYD 2002 276ff. I use 'duration' rather than 'rapidity' (= vitesse, which Genette came to prefer) to avoid confusion with the following section (Rapidity).

[51] The longest examples occur at 1.515ff. and 2.689ff. Cf. also 2.771ff. and 3.31ff. (which are also quite lengthy).

In the *Fasti* prolepsis is most frequently found in prophecies and divine pronouncements of various kinds.[52] It can make for clarity and a forward narrative thrust. It can also intrigue. For example, Ovid begins his explanation of the Fish constellation (quoted and translated above under Placement) by giving the end of the tale (at 2.459f.), leaving us to wonder how and why two fish carried gods on their backs. We also find typical complexity in this connection. So Rhea Silvia's prophetic vision of the palm-trees (at 3.31ff.) is itself an obvious instance of prolepsis, but it is recounted after she had the dream (in a flashback) and refers back symbolically (via the fallen headband) to her recent loss of virginity, and paradoxically all the tenses in this visionary flashforward are present or past. Here, as often in the poem, the prolepsis takes the form of prophecy and is given in speech, but (unusually, and divertingly) the speaker does not realize that her words are prophetic, the prefiguring is symbolic and riddling rather than explicit, and the source of the foreshadowing is unclear (was Mars or someone else responsible for the dream?).[53]

Analepsis is utilized for various effects. There is a brief but tragic example at 2.182, where after describing Callisto's wanderings in the wilds in her metamorphosed form as an ugly bear Ovid recalls that she had only recently been loved by supreme Jupiter himself. Among longer and more elaborate instances are the lines on the capture of Gabii (2.687ff.) and the oracle given by Apollo (2.711ff.): as Ovid is there supposed to be describing the rape of Lucretia that led to the downfall of the Tarquins (2.685), both of those passages are in fact flashbacks to prior events, but most readers will not realize that on first encountering them and will be puzzled by their relevance, so that the twofold analepsis functions as a double tease.[54] At 3.461ff. Ovid presents a sequel (without parallel and probably his own invention) to the story of Ariadne that looks back to her earlier adventures as history repeats itself. Here her husband Bacchus returns from his conquest of India with a beautiful princess whom he finds very attractive and seems to have abandoned Ariadne for her, but after Ariadne walks along the beach weeping and complaining he suddenly kisses her tears away and takes her up to heaven as the goddess Libera. The passage contains much analepsis (especially in connection with Theseus leaving Ariadne and her tears and complaints then), which brings out the cleverness and humour in Bacchus behaving rather as Theseus had but making things turn out well in the end again, and in Ariadne upbraiding herself over her ultimately inappropriate reaction to Theseus' treatment of her but then reacting in exactly the same ultimately inappropriate way all over again in connection with Bacchus' treatment of her (not having learnt her lesson). The lines also recall earlier poetry on Ariadne by Catullus and Ovid himself, so there is a literary as well as a temporal flashback.[55]

---

[52] At 1.496, 510, 515ff., 583f., 2.263f., 610, 713f., 3.31ff., 198, 345f., 4.197f., 559f., 5.97, 6.378 and 543ff.

[53] Cf. also 2.448, 713f. and 5.253f. for prolepsis within analepsis. In the anecdote about Chiron's death there is full prolepsis at 5.385 and 389, and there are many anticipatory hints rather than actual narration of future events (see p. 145).

[54] See pp. 229ff. For further complications here see 2.696 (analepsis within analepsis) and 2.713f. (prolepsis within analepsis).

Duration is concerned with the extent to which a narrative skims or dwells on an event. Maximum speed is represented by ellipse (whereby something that happened is not recounted), and at the opposite end of the scale the narrative is slowed right down by pause (where there is description, background information etc. in place of action, so that the story is halted). In between there is summary (a compression that summarizes actions), scene (the duration of events and that of the narrative are identical, as in direct quotation of a character's words) and stretch (a slow down, so that the narrative actually lasts longer than the action through repetition, lengthy paraphrase, mass of detail etc.).

I can find no clear example of stretch in these accounts, but pause is quite frequent (for descriptive pauses see above under Description, and for similes see below under Rapidity). So too is ellipse, which is sometimes openly announced,[56] but most often is just done without acknowledgement.[57] It often streamlines (see, for instance, the omission of Jupiter's metamorphosis into a bull and his enticing of Europa on to his back at 5.605ff.) and can also be tantalizing (e.g. after intimating a detailed depiction of the duel between Aeneas and Mezentius Ovid elides the fighting at 4.895).[58] By far the most common are scene and especially summary. An extreme form of summary is skimming, which is employed to make some rapists seem very aroused and fast workers,[59] to facilitate amusingly inadequate narratives at 6.657ff. and 697ff.[60] and above all to inject pace, drama and excitement (as at 2.709f., where in a single brisk couplet the decisive and energetic Sextus suddenly kills all the leading men at Gabii, renders the city walls defenceless and hands over the place to his father). Then again, Ovid often lingers over significant incidents to catch them fully and vividly, and he uses scene to highlight, build mood and so on. Remus' extended speech at 5.459ff, for example, gives him a new prominence and creates real pathos.[61] And at 2.797ff. Ovid dwells on the terrifying moments as Sextus intimidates Lucretia in her bed, slowing the narrative with pause at 797–800 and including scene at 801ff., where he presents her thoughts and objections as they occur to her (should she fight? she would be beaten; should she cry out? he has a sword in his hand etc.). Scene there is emotive and immediate, taking us inside Lucretia's head so that she comes even more alive for us[62] and we can empathize; it also accentuates her quandary, helplessness etc. and his brutality, lustfulness etc., reinforcing the strong contrast between the two characters and strengthening our sympathy for her and antipathy towards him.[63]

---

[55] See pp. 263ff.
[56] As at 3.55ff., 199f.
[57] So at 3.59 eighteen years in the early life of Romulus and Remus are dropped.
[58] See pp. 104f.

With regard to frequency by far the most common is 'singular event' (something occurs once and is narrated once). Also common, and rather more interesting, is 'iterative event', whereby something that happens more than once (e.g. the Spartan invasion of Attica) is recounted only once (e.g. 'The Spartans invaded Attica each year'). This is a useful shorthand to speed up the story, avoid tedium and vary tempo, and it can also emphasize an action and intensify its impact. So, when Ovid remarks at 2.313 that the enemy were killed by the Fabii often he elevates the Romans by means of the repetition; the power of Arion's music seems even greater at 2.84ff. because we are told that it had miraculous effects repeatedly; and Achilles' great love for Chiron is brought out at 5.409ff. by the constant caressing of his hands. The iteration at 6.107ff. does much to increase the humour and plays an important function in connection with plot.

---

[59] See p. 157.

[60] See pp. 59ff., 246f.

[61] See pp. 54f.

[62] Cf. NEWLANDS 149.

[63] Of course, Ovid does also vary the pace as well: see above under Cinematic Techniques and cf. Kenney in BOYD 2002 78ff.

There Ovid tells how Cranae foiled her suitors again and again by hiding behind their backs, until one day Janus turned up, saw exactly where she hid because he had eyes in the back of his head (which comically she had failed to notice) and forced her to keep her promise to have sex with him:

> inde sata est nymphe (Cranaen dixere priores)
>   nequiquam multis saepe petita procis.
> rura sequi iaculisque feras agitare solebat,
>   nodosasque cava tendere valle plagas; 110
> non habuit pharetram, Phoebi tamen esse sororem
>   credebant, nec erat, Phoebe, pudenda tibi.
> huic aliquis iuvenum dixisset amantia verba,
>   reddebat tales protinus illa sonos:
> 'haec loca lucis habent nimis, et cum luce pudoris: 115
>   si secreta magis ducis in antra, sequor.'
> credulus ante ut iit, frutices haec nacta resistit,
>   et latet et nullo est invenienda modo.

> A nymph was born there (men of old called her Cranae), who was often pursued by many suitors in vain. She used to range over the countryside, chase wild animals with her spears and spread her knotted nets in sunken valleys. She didn't have a quiver, but they thought that she was Phoebus' sister, and [as a sister] she would not have embarrassed you, Phoebus. Whenever some young man spoke words of love to her, she would immediately make this reply: 'This place has too much light, and the light entails too much embarrassment: if you lead the way to a more secluded cave, I'll follow.' He trustingly went ahead; when she reached bushes, she stopped and hid and couldn't be found at all.

There the 'iterative event' helps build an aptly humorous mood and erotic aura, and it raises anticipation of Cranae's come-uppance and loss of her virginity. It also makes for a leisurely feel, which by way of contrast underscores the speed of the subsequent rape by Janus. It contributes to the important theme of blindness too (again and again men fell for her trick and couldn't spot her, as later she did not see that Janus had two faces) and prepares for various inversions (e.g. many seek her unsuccessfully often, and then one seeks her successfully once). Note also that after the above lines there is more repetition (a doubling so appropriate for Janus), as the whole sequence of attraction, proposition and trick happens again with the god, and we are told twice that he could see her (123f.), had sex with her (126) and compensated her for the loss of her virginity (127f.).

Rapidity

Some of these accounts are not quick-moving overall (e.g. 4.249ff., 419ff.), and some parts of individual narratives are rather leisurely (e.g. 3.295ff.), but in the vast majority of cases there is a brisk progression and an easy flow, so that rapidity is a cardinal feature. Numerous factors contribute to this.

For a start these versions are usually short and so are soon perused: out of a total of 58 of them 49 are 50 verses or less; most frequent (17 examples) are tales of between 12 and 20 lines; and only 4 consist of a hundred verses or more. In most cases there is onward narrative drive thanks to a simple plot and a clear object (e.g. an *aetion*) with obvious progress towards it. Ovid often provides help at the start about what is to follow, and often tries to 'hook' our interest to get us to read on.[64] One can normally see the purpose behind what the poet is saying and so carry on undistracted; and readers soon learn that when the purpose is not immediately clear, they are being teased, intrigued etc. and it will become clear before too long. Ovid likes to keep a tight focus, avoiding peripheral material, repetition, rambling and unnecessary summarizing. In the many shorter pieces the narration tends to be condensed, impressionistic and economical, and Ovid eschews large effects, not developing mood, atmosphere or character[65] to any great extent.[66] He goes for lots of action[67] and keeps down distractions from that like authorial comment, moralizing, interjections, questions and asides;[68] description, extended speech and similes are also restricted.[69] Theme and variation (saying the same thing two or more times with slight modification)[70] is not very common and normally there is a good literary reason for it.[71] Listing is even rarer and always has point.[72] And in these narratives Ovid refrains from the parading of stylistic virtuosity for its own sake at the expense of the story-line, and actually restrains his dazzling technical skills and fondness for verbal play, paradox, epigram etc.[73]

---

[64] See pp. 210ff., 222ff.

[65] Cf. pp. 142f.

[66] Some might criticize his accounts as shallow and scrappy, but obviously he was not aiming at anything deep or grand with these illustrations and decorations, and generally there are in any case extra layers (e.g. literary or other learning) and subtle point.

[67] Especially fast-paced are passages packed with action and not much else at all (1.259ff., 2.361ff., 459ff., 4.197ff., 5.169ff.).

[68] In all the mythical and legendary versions I count only 17 (invariably brief) exclamations and similar interjections by the poet, 16 instances of rhetorical questions or questions directed at characters in the stories, and 36 asides by Ovid (most often less than a line long).

[69] On the paucity of description see the section on that topic above. Out of 164 instances of direct speech in all these narratives something between one word and a couplet is by far the most frequent form, while anything occupying ten lines or

The ease with which one reads these versions also contributes to the sense of rapidity. The subject-matter is generally appealing *per se* (sex, violence, unusual and novel material etc.), and one is normally kept engaged by Ovid's (humorous, vivid, inventive etc.) handling of it. In the main the expression also seems designed not to impede the flow. There is not much in the way of rare language.[74] Although the *Fasti* is, of course, a very scholarly poem, these accounts are largely free from diction complicated by abstruse learning.[75] Something else that makes them easy to read is the fact that Ovid favours short words,[76] simple rather than complex sentences (preferring parataxis to

---

more is rare (and normally occurs in the longer passages). There are merely 10 similes (8 of them taking up a distich or less) in these 2,318 lines, and 5 of them appear in the lengthier accounts.

[70] Cf. Kenney in BOYD 2002 74ff.

[71] E.g. at 2.83ff. it highlights the extensive and powerful effect of Arion's music, and at 4.641ff. it accentuates the gravity of the state of affairs.

[72] E.g. it brings out the length of the journey by Cybele and extent of the searching by Ceres at 4.278ff., 467ff., 499ff. and 563ff.

[73] There are conceits at 3.499ff., but apart from their humorous aspect they give Ariadne's words the flavour of the *Heroides* (especially 10.105) as part of the ingenious multiple allusion in that passage (see pp. 263ff.).

[74] Defining as 'rare' phrases, words, meanings and applications which occur less than 3 times in earlier and contemporary writing (including Ovid's own *Am., Her., A.A.* and *Rem.*), I searched the first 400 and last 100 words of narrative in *Fasti* 4 and found only eleven instances (*immergeo* 'devour' in 200; *indolesco* and *fertilitas* of persons in 202; *sedeo* 'settle, come to rest' in 205; *imitamen* in 211; *fatum* 'doom, cause of death' in 232; *sacrifer* in 252; *edomo* with miltary reference in 256; *carminis . . . Euboici* in 257; *pinetum* in 273; and *uro* of encaustic painting in 275). On Ovid's general predilection for ordinary language see FANTHAM 1998 42ff. and Kenney in BOYD 2002 36ff.; and on neologisms in Ovid see BOOTH 2696ff.

[75] For example, in the first 200 lines of these versions in book 2 there are only 18 instances of patronymics or other forms of periphrasis (in 89, 91, 94, 159, 167, 173, 191, 192, 237, 249, 305, 310, 318, 329, 349, 352, 353 and 356), and none of them is so recherché as to give one pause.

[76] I checked the first 1,000 words of narrative in book 5 and found that 64.6% consisted of one or two syllables, 26% of three syllables, 7% of four syllables and 2.4% of five syllables.

syntaxis),[77] a straightforward style of writing[78] and short sense-units.[79] In addition, frequent asyndeton makes for an unencumbered leanness,[80] and the overall predominance of dactyls[81] also increases the feeling of speed.

---

[77] For instance, in the first 200 verses of these passages in book 2 there are only 49 subordinate clauses, and in the vast majority of cases the clause occupies one line or less and there is only one clause per sentence. Cf. Kenney in BOYD 2002 29, 41.

[78] In the first 200 lines of narrative in *Fasti* 2 there is at all involved expression solely at 109f. and 113f.; there is only occasional and brief postposition of *qui* or conjunctions (e.g. in 192 and 329); and the placement of the subordinate clause first with its governing verb delayed is infrequent and does not involve an extensive delay (see e.g. 237). Cf. Kenney in BOYD 2002 70ff.

[79] In a random check of the first 100 couplets of these versions in book 1 and the first 100 in book 6 I discovered that the sense was complete by the end of the pentameter in 90% of cases. Some (e.g. OTIS 39, GINSBERG 10, Miller in BOYD 2002 189; cf. HERBERT-BROWN 1994 3) claim that these short sense-units make for a spasmodic jerkiness, while others (e.g. WORMELL 47, MACK 32) see nothing to complain of on this score. There is a subjective element here, but I myself see these (like brief sentences in a newspaper or thriller) as bite-sized chunks easy to digest so that one can move on quickly to another, and their overall effect seems to me to be lively and energetic.

[80] For example, at the start of the first 200 sentences and smaller sense-units marked by a strong stop in the narrative of *Fasti* 2 Ovid includes co-ordinating conjunctions in only 8% of cases (some comparative figures are: Catullus 64 36%, Virgil *Aen.* 6 27%, *Ciris* 44% and Sil.It. 24%).

[81] In the first 200 lines of these accounts in the first book 53.7% of variable feet are dactyls (to go with the regular dactylic fifth foot in hexameters and the second hemistich in the pentameter), a significantly higher proportion of dactyls than is found in the variable feet in mythical narrative at Catull. 64.31–130 (36.25%), Virg. *G.* 4.361–460 (39.75%), *Aen.* 12.1–100 (44.25%), *Ciris* 201–300 (44%) and Lucan 6.1–100 (42.5%). Out of those same 200 verses in *F.* 1 no hexameters at all contain 4 spondees, and only 21% contain 3 spondees, while 24% of pentameters have two initial dactyls and only 11% have two initial spondees. The first foot in particular tends to be dactylic: 84.5% of all the lines of narrative in the poem begin with a dactyl. This according to PLATNAUER 38 represents the highest proportion of initial dactyls in Ovidian elegy and the rest of elegy. It is also noticeably higher than the proportions found in random 100-line groups of narrative sampled in Catullus 64 (70%), Virgil *G.* 4 (52%), *Aen.* 1 (61%), *Ciris* (65%) and Lucan 2 (60%).

CHAPTER TWO

OTHER VOICES

Until the 1970s most critics simply glossed over Ovid's assignation of many of the narratives in the *Fasti* to characters within the poem (a major way of injecting variety, life and interest). They seem to have been unwilling to grant Ovid the minor courtesy of assuming that he knew what he was up to and had definite purposes in such an allocation of stories. They therefore overlooked all kinds of ingenuity and vivacity that become discernible upon a close engagement with the text and completely missed the perspective and point of a lot of passages. For, of course, the identity of the narrator is often of crucial importance for interpretation (with regard to credibility, colouring, irony and so on), as in Camus' *La Chute* and Faulkner's *The Sound and the Fury*, to name just two obvious examples.

During the last thirty years a few major features of the use of internal characters to narrate or inspire narratives in the *Fasti* have come in for study,[1] but it is still possible (and necessary) to build on this valuable work. These more recent scholars have discerned some of the diversity and humour in the poet's employment of these inner voices, but much more needs to be said about the typically Ovidian versatility and wit in this connection. So too they have questioned the trustworthiness of some of these gods who act as narrators and inspirers,[2] but not as fully as they should, and they have not appreciated properly the complexity of this issue. In fact many of these internal characters produce versions with an obvious partisan flavour and intriguingly appear to be possibly or certainly unreliable (because of clearly flawed and contradictory tales and similar devices).[3] In the case of inspirers the waters are muddied still further (and the extent of responsibility for narration and focalization (point of view)[4] is problematized), as Ovid could be supposed to be not entirely accurate or even adding input of his own (note, for example, the difficulty over the provenance of the address to Bacchus in a line inspired by Bacchus at 6.486). One presumes that in accordance with the fiction Ovid is in the main reproducing the inspiring deity's presentation of the story, and exactly the same kind of personal bias, colouring etc. is as evident with these inspirers as it is with actual narrators, so that they should be viewed as (rather complex) variants on narrators. As well as making a serious observation about the confusion in the tradition and the untrustworthiness of individual accounts, at times it seems that Ovid is ribbing his readers by making things maddeningly unclear. There is also the paradox of the author being under the control of his own creations (perhaps reflecting the way in which a story can seem to take over and go off in its own direction).

---

[1] See especially FRÉCAUT 275ff., RUTLEDGE 322ff., MILLER 1983 156ff., HARRIES 1989 168ff., MYERS 1994 67ff., NEWLANDS 63f., 68ff., 81ff., BARCHIESI 2001 49ff. and Schiesaro, Barchiesi and Newlands in HARDIE 2002 64f., 181ff., 207ff. On Callimachus as Ovid's model here and for his departures from Callimachus (a problematic issue in view of the fragmentary nature of the *Aetia*) see MILLER 1983 in particular and also RUTLEDGE and MYERS 1994. FRÉCAUT points out that Tibullus 1.4 and Propertius 4.2 may also have functioned as models. For internal narrators in the *Metamorphoses* see Rosati in BOYD 2002 271ff. Useful research has also been done on Ovid's construction of himself as a narrator in the *Fasti* (see e.g. MACK 32f., MILLER 1991 10, 82, 141 and NEWLANDS 51ff.). There he presents himself as *inter alia* a skilled and stylish raconteur, and a dedicated student who is frequently tentative, sometimes serious and sometimes flippant, and who possesses limited knowledge and is often left floundering by the complexity of the topic. The relationship of this narrating 'Ovid' to the historical Ovid is, of course, very problematical, but I would deduce that the real Ovid (like the 'Ovid' in the *Fasti*) possessed characteristics evident elsewhere in his poetic oeuvre, like wit, ingenuity and versatility.

Several other important features also need highlighting. For example, these internal narrators have distinct and developed personalities (as well as their own agendas) and really live (albeit briefly) in their own right. Also they often give a novel twist to an old story, changing the stress, providing a new viewpoint, subverting and 'correcting' current versions by Livy and Virgil, and so on. So too they are not random or unconsidered choices: most frequently they have some sort of connection with their narratives (e.g. they or relatives of theirs figure prominently in them), so that there is more life and feeling than there would be in the case of someone uninvolved; and there is usually aptness and witty or complex point in getting a particular figure to recount or prompt a tale (so at 5.451ff. Mercury is selected to inspire a passage on a vision of the dead Remus seen by Faustulus and Acca, so that the god who escorts the souls of the dead describes a visit by a ghost, the god with the soporific *caduceus*[5] tells of something seen in a dream, and the god of eloquence is responsible for an eloquently moving, sombre and vivid account). Also important is the extensive mockery of the conventions of divine inspiration (as found in Homer, Hesiod, Virgil, Propertius etc.) and divine interlocutors (as found in Callimachus' *Aetia* in particular). For, of course, although he initially toys with this idea, Ovid is not really (as many have thought) using these divine narrators and inspirers as a way of getting authentification for these narratives. The poet who had been openly sceptical about the existence of the gods[6] did not seriously expect his readers to believe that these interchanges actually took place, especially as they mount up and up and involve so many different deities and are so frequently frivolous.[7] And as well as undermining the gods by making their veracity seem questionable, he also uses them to engage in clever and amusing play. For example, in addition to the basic joke of having himself instructed by a character of his own creation about material with which he is manifestly familiar, he is terrified by his Janus at 1.97f. and Cybele's attendants at 4.189f., is bamboozled and perplexed by the Muses at 5.11ff. and 81ff. (see further below) and has his account of the rape of the Sabine women postponed by a high-handed Mars at 3.199f. Also part of the rather intricate (and largely unappreciated) fun in the interaction between Ovid and his divine internal narrators is the way in which he slyly has himself praised by them as a diligent bard (1.101, 3.177) and praises their narratives (= his own compositions) personally (4.245, 5.698) or via other characters in his poem (5.53f., 107, of incompetent performances), and has his own derivation of *Maius* ('May') contradicted by two of these divinities (5.11ff., 81ff.; contrast 1.41), and is chided for his ignorance and lectured (on the old and obvious topic of human greed) by another one of them (1.191ff.).

---

[2] See HARRIES 1989 170f., 177ff., HINDS 1992 144ff., BARCHIESI 1997 121f. and NEWLANDS 63, 68, 85.

[3] On the unreliable narrator see especially CHATMAN 233ff. and RIMMON-KENAN 100ff.

[4] On focalization see e.g. BAL 100ff., GENETTE 1988 72ff. and de JONG.

---

[5] E.g. *Met.* 1.715f.

[6] *A.A.* 1.637.

[7] The remarks at 3.167f. and 6.3ff. are all part of the fun.

General Context

Before we study all these major features in action some general context will provide helpful backgound. Out of the fifty-eight legendary and mythical narratives in the *Fasti* thirteen are put in the mouth of an inner narrator and another six are inspired by a character in the poem.[8] So almost a third of the stories are ascribed to somebody other than Ovid,[9] enough to give a change from the poet's voice without over-using the technique. So too these stories are carefully spaced and spread out: in the first three books there are only two non-Ovidian narrators and three inspirers (neither type appears in book 2); the other fourteen cases occur in books 3 to 6 (four in book 4, seven in book 5, three in book 6), as the poet rings the changes and goes for variety as he gets further into the poem. There is also variety in the sex, status and personality of the thirteen characters who so report or stimulate, and in the length and subject matter of their passages. So too six of these narrators are homodiegetic (i.e. characters in the stories that they recount), while seven of them are heterodiegetic (not characters in their own tales); of the inspirers five figure as characters in the accounts that they engender, while one does not. Homodiegetic narrators and inspirers usually act, and act significantly, in their narratives, but Tiber (5.639ff.) and Bacchus (6.485ff.) just relate or inspire.[10]

The inner narrators and inspirers are all divinities (and, not unnaturally, such narrators tend to be omniscient),[11] and all of them address themselves to Ovid in response to a request by him for information, which they duly supply in the vast majority of cases. Normally these gods and goddesses are responsible for just a single story at a time, but to avoid monotony Erato is given a sequence of three to tell, and Flora relates two closely successive ones (5.195–214, 231–260), while Carmentis inspires two on the run.[12] There is patterning on a broader scale as well. In the six books that we have the first three inspirers are female, while the last three are male. Of the passages that they are behind the first two go together to form a couple (both come from Carmentis and are set in the time of Evander), the third is free-standing, then comes another couple (the fourth and fifth both concern the murder of Remus), and the sixth is again free-standing (and in it, as in the first two, Carmentis, Hercules and Evander figure). There is also grouping (especially in pairs) of the stories actually told by these divinities.[13] In the first two both narrators (Janus and Mars) help Rome in the same war against the Sabines, imminent fighting ends, and Juno and a mortal female protagonist are common. Next in book 4 the three successive narratives by Erato (all about Cybele) obviously go together. In book 5 there are two explanations of the derivation of the name May in the mouths of two Muses in competition; and then Flora within the same long speech passes on two anecdotes relevant to her identity and nature; finally after all those females comes another pair of males (Tiber and Mercury), who come out with two narratives within forty lines of each other in which there are Greek protagonists, fights over booty, multiple deaths and brief speeches to secure some comfort with regard to those deaths. In book 6 Minerva in the context of the Lesser Quinquatrus produces two closely successive passages connected with the flute.

---

[8] Inner narrators occur at 1.259ff. (Janus), 3.179ff. (Mars), 4.197ff. (Erato), 223ff. (Erato), 249ff. (Erato), 5.11ff. (Polyhymnia), 81ff. (Calliope), 195ff. (Flora), 231ff. (Flora), 639ff. (Tiber), 699ff. (Mercury), 6.657ff. (Minerva), 697ff. (Minerva); the inspired passages are 1.469ff. (Carmentis), 543ff. (Carmentis), 3.277ff. (Egeria), 4.809ff. (Quirinus), 5.451ff. (Mercury) and 6.485ff. (Bacchus).

[9] And the very first legendary narrative in the poem (1.259ff.) is not by Ovid but by Janus.

[10] On the distinction between homodiegetic and heterodiegetic narrators see GENETTE 1972 255f. and BAL 122ff. (who calls them character-bound and external narrators). The former occur at 1.259ff., 3.179ff., 5.195ff., 231ff., 639ff., 6.697f. Of the inspirers only Mercury (at 5.451ff.) does not figure in the lines that he inspires.

[11] So most of them demonstrate familiarity with characters' inner thoughts, feelings and intentions, have knowledge of past, present and future, show an awareness of characters in locations where the characters are supposed to be alone etc. (cf. CHATMAN 215ff., RIMMON-KENAN 95).

Ingenuity and diversity are evident in connection with the mise-en-scène. With inspirers most frequently Ovid just asks for help and then launches into his narrative, intimating that he has duly been inspired (with convenient and suspicious promptness). In the case of divine narrators sometimes they just tell their tale but often there is some lively business by way of preamble. So at 1.259, before he launches into the story of how he helped the Romans against the Sabines, Janus strokes his long beard in a reflective and perhaps rather self-satisfied fashion; and at 6.655 Minerva lays aside her spear, prior to an anecdote about flautists and a squabble that had a peaceful ending. Sometimes these divine story-tellers are formally invoked, but sometimes with droll nonchalance Ovid does not even bother to explain their presence; at 4.181ff., with an imaginative touch, Cybele enters the poem as part of the procession at her festival, and Ovid jokingly pretends to be so frightened by the noise of her cymbals and flutes that he asks her to provide him with an informant, and she then tells her granddaughters the Muses to answer his questions. The scene-setting can be particularly apt, and also mischievously misleading. At 5.183ff. Flora is summoned as mother of flowers and the goddess of the sportive Floralia, and in chatty and relaxed lines Ovid explains how he has put off the description of her festival until now because it extends into May; she then immediately responds to his request for information with lips that breathed spring roses. This all prepares the way perfectly for the light and amusing speech by this chatterbox of a goddess in which flowers are so prominent, and for one who was raped by Zephyrus there are appropriate associations in the allusion to spring and roses. Then again at 5.635ff. Ovid builds up the god Tiber as a venerable figure who should know well the origins of the rite of throwing dummies made of rushes into the river, only to deflate his authority completely a few lines later (see further below).

---

[12] See 4.197ff., 223ff., 249ff.; 5.195ff., 231ff.; 1.469ff., 543ff.

[13] For pairing in the *Fasti* cf. BRAUN 2355ff.

To illustrate the major features of these inner voices as listed above, in the rest of this chapter the nineteen passages in question will be considered with particular attention to the effect of the divinities who lie behind them. All nineteen will be considered to provide comprehensive corroboration (and because they all repay close attention). They will be studied in the order in which they appear in the poem in particular to bring out the ongoing tease about reliability and to clarify the great versatility of the poet, who as he progresses in the *Fasti* constantly ensures variation and constantly alters and develops the role of these personages and its impact on the reader.

1.259ff. (Janus)

When Ovid asks Janus why his cult is based in the particular archway where his shrine adjoins two forums, the god replies at 1.259ff.:

> ille, manu mulcens propexam ad pectora barbam,
> protinus Oebalii rettulit arma Tati,
> utque levis custos, armillis capta, Sabinos
> ad summae tacitos duxerit arcis iter.

> 'inde, velut nunc est, per quem descenditis,' inquit
> 'arduus in valles per fora clivus erat.
> et iam contigerat portam, Saturnia cuius 265
> dempserat oppositas invidiosa seras;
> cum tanto veritus committere numine pugnam,
> ipse meae movi callidus artis opus,
> oraque, qua pollens ope sum, fontana reclusi,
> sumque repentinas eiaculatus aquas. 270
> ante tamen madidis subieci sulpura venis,
> clauderet ut Tatio fervidus umor iter.
> cuius ut utilitas pulsis percepta Sabinis,
> quae fuerat, tuto reddita forma loco est;
> ara mihi posita est parvo coniuncta sacello: 275
> haec adolet flammis cum strue farra suis.'

> As his hand stroked the beard combed down on to his chest, he immediately told of the siege by Oebalian [i.e. of Spartan origin] Tatius and how the traitorous guard, won over by their armlets, led the silent Sabines to the path up to the citadel's summit. 'From there,' he said, 'there was a steep slope down into the valleys through the forums, the same one by which you descend now. They had already reached the gate, and hateful/jealous Juno had removed the bars that closed it against them. Afraid to join battle with such a mighty goddess, I craftily had recourse to my area of expertise: using my own ample power, I opened up springs and suddenly sent them spurting up. But first I put sulphur into the water channels, so boiling liquid would block Tatius' path. When I saw that this worked by driving off the Sabines, now that the place was safe I returned it to its original form. An altar was set up to me, with a small shrine near it, and in its flames are burned spelt and offering-cakes.'

There is subtle point in giving the god of beginnings the first legendary narrative in the *Fasti* and making him the first non-Ovidian narrator. By highlighting this particular incident and his own role Janus provides a new focus for the tale of Tarpeia, taking away from the traitress the prominence that she had in Livy 1.11 and Propertius 4.4. Before this passage his character had been built up to resemble that of an uncle who is initially imposing but actually friendly once one gets to know him,[14] and here he kindly helps his own Romans[15] at a crucial point when they are in great danger, even though this means acting contrary to the queen of the gods herself.

---

[14] FRÄNKEL p. 241 n. 16 described him as a 'good old uncle'. Janus at first frightens Ovid (1.97f.), but soon tries to put him at his ease (1.101), and Ovid increasingly relaxes as the god jokes about his names (1.129f.), laughs (1.191) and is droll at the expense of Jupiter at 1.201 (cf. MILLER 1983 165f.).

[15] For Janus' connection with Rome cf. e.g. 1.241ff.

There is also a gentle humour here (appropriately enough for most of the narratives that will follow). Janus mischievously cheats expectations of a description of fighting[16] and of the end of Tarpeia. And although the god seems to be quite modest and is quite brief about this episode, he does at the same time quietly ensure that he brings out his bravery in opposing the powerful Juno, his ingenuity and the importance of his help (the Sabines were at the very gate, which had been unbolted, and were about to fall on the Romans unobserved when he acted, and the efficacy of his action is underlined in 273 and 275). Although one can discern Janus' pride, there seems to be no particular reason to disbelieve him, and so some might assume that the god is being used to privilege and authenticate what is in fact an unusual account.[17] Such assumptions are called into question more and more in succeeding narratives.

1.469ff. (Carmentis)

At 1.467f. Ovid appeals to Carmentis for help in connection with the origins and practices of the Carmentalia, and at 469ff., presumably prompted by her, he goes on to describe her flight from Arcadia to Italy along with her son Evander.[18] We move from Janus to a minor goddess, from a narrator to an inspirer, and from the god's brief and rather modest tale to a long passage in which Carmentis dominates and plays up her own part over the course of a full seventy-four lines.

Ovid is here amusing himself, by wondering what it might have been like for the youthful hero Evander to have a mother who possessed prophetic powers and was also divine, and by depicting Carmentis as the type of mother who always knows best, who is protective, overshadowing and in control. Uniquely in such narratives in the *Fasti* Carmentis gives herself the distinction of two lengthy speeches—the first to steel Evander as they go into exile, the second (after they have arrived at their destination) to greet their new homeland and prophesy its coming glories. She virtually elides her son and makes the whole story revolve around herself, vigorously taking up Ovid's invitation in 468 to make sure that she receives honour. According to the lines supplied by her, she assumed the leadership role, foretelling the exile, carefully stiffening Evander's resolve, guiding the ship, telling her son when they had reached their destination and formally hailing the land and its gods. She also gives weight to her various and numerous predictions at that point in a solemn passage on the great achievements of Aeneas' Trojans and Rome; and she doesn't just prophesy, she prophesies with style, giving herself an arresting and elegant turn of phrase[19] that further draws attention to her—e.g. challenging expression in 515 ('these hills will become mighty walls'), 517 and 524; provocative commands in 522 and 525 (where she bids Pallas to arm for battle and the flames to destroy Troy); paradoxes in 526 and 530; and marked sound effects (especially in 515 *fallor, an hi fient ingentia moenia colles* and 523 *victa tamen vinces eversaque, Troia, resurges*). It is now even more clear that the gods behind these narratives can have their own axes to grind, and the very first line of this passage (469: 'Arcadia arose before the moon, if you believe the inhabitants of that land') may plant a tiny seed of doubt about the credibility of the Arcadian Carmentis' version of events.

---

[16] So BARCHIESI 1997 21.

[17] See BÖMER II 35.

[18] Here, as elsewhere, there is a poignant tinge in the reference to exile.

At the same time Ovid is expanding on Evander's brief mention of his flight to Italy at Virgil *Aeneid* 8.333ff. (with much enhancement of Carmentis' small role there) and giving a piquant twist to the Virgilian Evander in general. In Ovid, as Carmentis acquires a new prominence in Latin literature, Evander is made into a minor figure, silent (not making lengthy speeches, as in the *Aeneid*) and a son rather than a father (here *he* is the one with the loving and authoritative parent); and in place of the august, settled and powerful old king of Virgil we find in the *Fasti* passage a young exile who receives orders (480, 487, 496) and directions from his mother, and who is weak (hence 479f. and the need for an extensive speech by Carmentis to put some resolve into him).[20]

---

[19] Aptly enough for one whose name is connected with *carmen* (= 'poetry' as well as 'prophecy') at 1.467. Cf. pp. 115f. and 118f.

[20] See further pp. 123f. and 127f. For more on Evander in the *Fasti* see FANTHAM 1992a.

1.543ff. (Carmentis)

At line 543, while still supposedly under the influence of Carmentis, Ovid takes us abruptly from the above episode on to Hercules' encounter with Cacus. It is a novel and surprising touch to make a divinity responsible for a second narrative in succession like this. Carmentis again minimizes Evander, but this time, unexpectedly, she also elides herself from the story, until comically contriving to work herself in at the very end (583f.) with a prophecy of Hercules' coming deification, so that we leave these lines with her in our thoughts.

But, if you think about it, really Carmentis is imposing herself throughout 543ff. The great length at which a rather minor incident is told at 469–542 implies that while inspiring those verses the goddess ran on and on (especially to highlight herself) and dominated the poet (as she dominated her son). The forty-two lines here on Cacus get even further away from Ovid's request at 467f. for information about the Carmentalia (and she never does provide that information). It looks as if Carmentis has lost sight of Ovid's plea and (rather fond of the sound of her own voice) is here again controlling the narrative, evincing gratitude to Hercules for rescuing the new settlement from danger and acute embarrassment (551), but also showing off her knowledge and story-telling skill, giving another instance of her prophetic powers and building herself up further by association with a great hero and a great adventure.

There would appear to be additional point in all this. There are numerous similarities and dissimilarities between Ovid's lines on Cacus and Virgil's at *Aeneid* 8.185ff.,[21] and one cannot read Ovid without thinking of Virgil. The epic account was put in the mouth of Evander, and it is tempting to see an outré literary joke here, with Carmentis correcting and undermining her son (mother knows best again), and having the last word. In the *Aeneid* Evander speaks as an eye-witness, but it is not explained how he could have been close to the action, especially at the end of the fight in the deep, dark cave of Cacus. Ovid's Carmentis may well have an eye to that in 580, when she has Hercules summon Evander after his victory, implying that Evander was at some distance, perhaps at some considerable distance, from the very violent and dangerous combat (as would be only natural). In addition, she inspires a shorter and more low-key version of the encounter with Cacus, intimating that it was not such a major event for a superhero who was shortly to be deified (as she herself reminds us in 583f.). Her Hercules (who, unlike Evander's, is bright enough to spot that some of his cattle are missing) does not fall into a furious rage but is just quietly and grimly intent on revenge. According to Evander Hercules despite three attempts could not shift the large boulder that Cacus dropped to block the entrance to his cave (although he does manage at the first attempt to tear off the huge cliff that forms the top of the cave); according to Carmentis the hero who did after all bear the sky on his shoulders (565) just walked up and shoved aside the boulder at the mouth of the cave. She also makes the subsequent fight with Cacus briefer and easier for the superhero and has him use his traditional club in a businesslike manner to kill Cacus, in contrast to the sensational climax in the *Aeneid* where Hercules throttles Cacus until the blood drains from his throat and his eyes burst out. Doesn't it look as if Evander (who can't have had a very good view after all) was guilty of exaggeration, whereas one can accept what a goddess and a prophetess has to say? Or can one with this goddess?

---

[21] See e.g. p. 116, BÖMER II 63ff., SCHUBERT, MERLI 2000 283ff.

3.179ff. (Mars)

At 3.179ff. we are back to a narrator and to a male and major divinity (Mars). There is again a certain bias, but this time the deity plays up others rather than himself, as he tells how his Romans were turned down by their neighbours as sons-in-law and after the rape of the Sabine women were on the point of joining battle with the angry parents until Romulus' wife and the other ravished girls intervened and brought about peace. Mars is characterized as fond and proud of his Romans, his son and his daughter-in-law, and his involvement comes through to add life and feeling to the lines. So at 179ff. he lingers affectionately on the simple but tough beginnings and eventual glory of Rome and Romulus; at 187ff. he dwells with outrage on the neighbouring peoples' rejection of the Romans because of their humble circumstances; and at 205ff. he brings out his daughter-in-law's dutifulness, ingenuity and bravery in engineering the intervention on the battlefield. In fact so proud is he of her that, although he does show a typically martial spirit at 197f., he actually approves of her putting an end to the war.

In fact Mars is an inspired choice as narrator. He of all people tells a tale of frustrated fighting with a peaceful ending.[22] Clearly galled, he explains at 190 that people would not believe that he was Romulus' father. The rapist of Ilia takes credit for prompting the rape of the Sabines at 197f. but then, as an overt and self-conscious narrator,[23] he teasingly refuses to describe that rape at 199f. (and postpones it until later in the *Fasti*!). And above all the brutal and furious god of war shows himself to be so tender and sentimental at 215ff. (thereby enabling Ovid to get the pathos and emotional appeal of the story's climax without it being cloying, because it is also piquant and entertaining in the mouth of Mars):

> iam steterant acies ferro mortique paratae, 215
> iam lituus pugnae signa daturus erat,
> cum raptae veniunt inter patresque virosque,
> inque sinu natos, pignora cara, tenent.
> ut medium campi scissis tetigere capillis,
> in terram posito procubuere genu; 220
> et, quasi sentirent, blando clamore nepotes
> tendebant ad avos bracchia parva suos.
> qui poterat, clamabat avum tum denique visum,
> et, qui vix poterat, posse coactus erat.
> tela viris animique cadunt, gladiisque remotis 225
> dant soceri generis accipiuntque manus,
> laudatasque tenent natas, scutoque nepotem
> fert avus: hic scuti dulcior usus erat.

> The battle-lines had already taken up position ready for fighting and death, the bugle was already on the point of giving the signal for battle, when the abducted women came between their fathers and husbands, holding in their bosoms their children, those dear tokens of love. They had torn their hair, and when they reached the middle of the plain, they sank down to the ground on their knees; and (as if they understood) with appealing cries the grandchildren stretched out their little arms to their grandfathers. Now that they saw them at last, the children who could manage it cried out to their grandfathers, and

---

[22] Comparison with Livy 1.11ff. shows how much of the fighting Mars has missed out and how he increases the part played by his daughter-in-law.

[23] On such a narrator (one who is aware of and comments on the process of narrating) see e.g. CHATMAN 219ff.

> those who couldn't manage it were made to manage it. The men's weapons and animosity fell; the fathers-in-law put their swords aside, reached out to their sons-in-law and clasped their hands, then praised and embraced their daughters. Grandfathers carried their grandchildren on their shields, and that was a sweeter use of the shield.

The sly joke in 224 (of the children being pinched to make them cry) is complemented by more humour in the lines that follow the above passage. Mars had come out with this anecdote as a rather lengthy and elaborate explanation of why he was worshipped by matrons on the first of March, but at 233ff. he proceeds to undercut it by offering other explanations, one of which he finally (at 249ff.) accepts as the true one. This narrator is not only partisan but also quite slow-witted and unfocussed.[24]

3.277ff. (Egeria)

Even more partial, but this time touchingly so, is Egeria, who helps Ovid with a story about Numa and the shield that fell from heaven at 3.277ff. Like Carmentis she inspires an extensive narrative (one hundred and sixteen lines), but in her case it is for the sake of her husband rather than herself. When asked by Ovid at 259f. to explain why the priests called the Salii carry the sacred shields and sing of Mamurius, she is responsible for a long and involved explication whose logical connections are generally left to be inferred, probably because Egeria is deliberately trying to engage Ovid and his readers. Presumably Jupiter wanted to reward Numa's concern for religion and justice (277ff.) by giving him the sacred shield which was a pledge of sovreignty, but instead of just giving him it he sent a great rain of thunderbolts (apparently to test his ingenuity and courage for further proof that he was worthy of the shield). Egeria told her husband how to find a method of expiating the thunderbolts (on her advice he captured Faunus and Picus by getting them drunk, they drew down Jupiter, who when asked how to expiate his bolts concealed the truth, but Numa saw through his trickery). After Numa had passed that test, Jupiter set him up to receive the shield the next day in front of his subjects and when it duly fell from heaven,

---

[24] Cf. NEWLANDS 68.

Numa shrewdly had copies made by a smith called Mamurius, entrusted them to the Salii and at Mamurius' request had them sing his name at the end of their song by way of a reward.[25]

Before this account Ovid reminded us that Egeria was Numa's wife twice (in 262 and 276) and also (in 275) alluded to the myth that she wept for her dead husband until turned into a stream. This means that the narrative has an affecting tinge that it would not have with any other inspirer. One can easily see that what Egeria is doing here is not simply answering Ovid's question in 259f. but giving him much more than that, telling the full story in detail (even though it is not strictly necessary). It is an obvious inference that lots of memories come crowding back to her and she lets them pour out as she dwells affectionately on her dead husband, happy to recall how she was able to help him, and perhaps trying to make him live again in this way. Egeria would also seem to be holding back the appearance of the shield for two thirds of her account as a way of producing a build-up to it and of expanding the incident[26] into something substantial (almost epic), and to be working in many details and incidents that show Numa in a good light and many qualities (piety, justice, intelligence, bravery etc.) that would win admiration for him among Ovid's readers and keep his memory alive. So, although it is engrossing and at times amusing (e.g. the capture of Faunus and Picus), this passage definitely has its sad side, and Egeria is a touching choice as inspirer who appears to love and miss her husband still after all those years.[27]

At the same time, and typically, Egeria is a clever choice as inspirer, and with this story Ovid deftly exploits other associations of hers. For instance, Egeria who instructed Numa about religious practices[28] and on how to get instruction from Faunus and Picus is here instructing Ovid; and this deity who is connected with springs, groves and a cave[29] tells Numa to catch Picus and Faunus in a grove with a spring and with a cave nearby (cf. 295ff.). It may also be not by chance that a goddess who was turned into a stream (273ff.) here prompts a narrative that runs on and on.

---

[25] It also appears that before this passage nobody connected Faunus and Picus and the drawing down of Jupiter and the discovery of the method of expiation with the shield that fell from heaven, so that readers would have been puzzled about the relevance of these lines until the end.

[26] A minor detail in Livy 1.20.4.

[27] That darker tinge is ushered in at 263ff. with the sombre grove, the various deaths and the grim 271.

[28] E.g. Ovid *Met.* 15.482, Plutarch *Numa* 8.6, 13.1.

[29] E.g. 3.261ff., *Met.* 15.488, 547ff., Livy 1.21.3, Juv. 3.12f., 17.

4.197ff. (Erato)

At 4.197ff. for a change we progress to a Greek narrator, a minimal narrative and much humour. We also move on to a heterodiegetic narrator (in fact this is the first in a series of five narratives by heterodiegetic narrators, all of them Muses—Erato, Polyhymnia and Calliope). Erato (one of the Muses delegated by her grandmother Cybele to answer Ovid's questions) is asked why Cybele rejoices in a great din and replies briefly that it all goes back to the Curetes and Corybantes making a noise to drown out the cries of the infant Jupiter (when rescued from the baby-eating Saturn). At first sight this might seem a disappointingly short and colourless narrative; and it is short and colourless, but for a very good reason. Comically Erato has been put on the spot by this rather awkward question of Ovid's which touches on cannibalism and deceit in her own family. She is loyal to her grandmother (as is clear from the next narratives and her sympathy at 201f. to Cybele's complaints at losing her children); but Saturn is her grandfather (and she does not condemn him herself); while matters are further complicated by the fact that Jupiter is her father. One senses squirming here, as Erato diplomatically skims and abbreviates in general and skates over the violence and horror in particular. There is also a joke in a Muse (and a daughter of Mnemosyne) appealing in 203f. to the evidence of antiquity: the point would appear to be that the goddess, embarrassed by the stupidity of her grandfather in swallowing a stone in place of a baby, imagines that people might not believe her when she tells them of this bizarre oversight. In addition, the whole exchange with Erato amounts to a flippant reprise of Callimachus' conversation with the Muses in the *Aetia*, and Ovid may also be mocking solemn epic invocations of Erato at a momentous point at or near the start of books[30] (rather than being invoked she is passed on to him as a substitute, far into his book, at a by no means momentous moment, and in place of the silent inspiration found in epic here Ovid makes her speak and later talks back to her and in the course of a cosy chat almost grills her with a series of questions).

---

[30] See Ap. Rhod. 3.1ff., Virg. *Aen.* 7.37ff. Compare *A.A.* 2.16.

4.223ff. (Erato)

A good joke bears repeating, and so at 4. 221f. Ovid goes on to ask why Cybele's priests cut themselves. This is also a rather uncomfortable question for Erato, as the practice is said to have gone back to the castration of Attis (a boy loved by Cybele who broke his vow to remain a virgin in her service by having sex with the nymph Sagaritis and so, while she was killed by Cybele, he was driven mad by the goddess and mutilated himself). Since this explanation does not involve her grandfather being beastly, Erato can relax a bit and produces a slightly longer narrative, but she is still somewhat on the defensive, as she decribes two grim punishments meted out by her grandmother. So she is quick to point out that Cybele's love for Attis was a chaste one (224) and produces a brisk and businesslike account, passing up an obvious chance to bring out the pathos and horror, and in fact showing no sympathy at all for Attis or Sagaritis. She does not play down the punishment of the boy but allocates ten out of her twenty verses to it (it is a crucial part of the *aetion*, and there also seems to be (fairly sobering) divine satisfaction here). But she is also careful to justify this retribution: at 227f. she depicts the boy as formally swearing to remain a virgin and praying that if he breaks his oath may that act of sex be his last, and at 239ff. she makes him state twice that he deserves his punishment and pray twice for the destruction of his genitalia.

There may also be a literary jest again. Few would have read this account without having Catullus' memorable poem 63 in mind, especially in view of various echoes of that poem in these lines.[31] Although it is a somewhat surreal touch, if Erato can hold a conversation with Ovid, then, especially as she is a Muse, she could be imagined to have read Catullus 63 and to be reacting to it here and rehabilitating her grandma. In 63 Attis in a fit of madness (presumably sent by Cybele to secure herself a servant) castrates himself and dedicates himself to the goddess, but after sleeping regains his sanity and deeply regrets his actions; when Cybele hears this, she sends a lion to send Attis mad and drive him back into her grove, to be her slave for the rest of his life. There Cybele seems harsh and vindictive,[32] and there is obvious sympathy for Attis (at 48ff. and especially 58ff.). Here Erato minimizes the whole episode (reducing it to 20 lines) and presents Attis as a perjurer who admits himself that he deserves castration, while Cybele is loving (224) and entirely justified.

---

[31] Cf. FANTHAM 1998 139ff., LITTLEWOOD 1981 389ff.

4.249ff. (Erato)

At 4.249ff., for the first time with these narrators and inspirers, a third narrative on the run is assigned to a divinity, and unexpectedly this is a much longer one than the previous two. When Ovid asks where Cybele was brought from to Rome, Erato tells how she was conveyed across the sea from the kingdom of Attalus of Pergamum (who was commanded by the goddess to let her go), the ship grounded in the Tiber and was miraculously pulled free by Claudia Quinta (a woman accused of immorality who asked Cybele to prove her chastity by letting her drag the ship clear) and then the goddess was received in Rome by Nasica. Because this time Ovid has not put her on the spot with his question, at last the Muse can relax fully and actually be expansive, and even verbose (especially at 277ff. and 329ff.). Although the last two tales were intrinsically far more dramatic, sensational and emotive, she chooses to dwell on this (less exciting) one at great length, because it shows her grandmother in a good light.

Erato here seems to be taking pains and taking her time specifically to correct any negative inferences about granny from the two earlier passages, depicting her as an august and mighty deity (in contrast to the faceless and powerless figure of 4.197ff.), and one who was kind to a (chaste and pious) human (in contrast to punishing Attis). She is also generally elevating Cybele. So her move is given an impressive oracular background, sanctioned by destiny and Apollo; she miraculously speaks from her own shrine, cowing king Attalus; she is behind the remarkable prodigy involving Claudia; and she is greeted with supreme reverence in Rome. So too her journey is given an epic aura. It is made into a great voyage by the lengthy list of place names at 277ff., many of which have Homeric and Virgilian associations.[33] And it is rather like the journey of the venerable Aeneas: it is also long and in accordance with the will of fate; it starts (as is explicitly stated at 273f.) and ends similarly and passes several places passed by Aeneas (e.g. the Cyclades, Crete, Sicily); and again there is a ship carrying divinity which runs into problems before finally reaching its destination.[34]

---

[32] Cf. GODWIN 123f.

There may be particular point here. If a Muse may be envisaged as reading Catullus, she could be imagined to read prose as well, and Erato here may be thought of as trying to improve on Livy's version of this incident (at 29.10, 11 and 14) by building it into something much more poetic, dramatic and numinous and playing up the role of Cybele. Unlike Livy, Erato has the goddess herself transported (rather than a mere meteoric stone), keeps her before our eyes for much of the time, gives her journey an epic flavour, has her greeted by all Rome with great respect, and makes the whole episode more marvellous (Claudia pulling the ship free and so on).

4.809ff. (Quirinus)

At 4.809ff. we are back to a Roman god and a much shorter narrative, and for the first time in these passages there is extensive pathos and the reader has serious grounds for actually disbelieving the divinity.

In the description of the foundation of Rome and death of Remus that he inspires Quirinus depicts himself and his brother as in harmony from the start. Quirinus (Romulus) suggests that they resort to augury instead of squabbling over who should rule their new city and here he is the undisputed winner of the contest with the birds. Upright and punctilious, he follows all the proper formalities in marking out the line of the walls, praying for heaven's favour and duly receiving a sign of it. Then, as the actual building begins, he orders Celer to kill anyone who leaps over the rising walls, and Remus, in ignorance of the order, does just that and is immediately murdered by Celer (before he could have been headed off). Presented with this fait accompli, at first Romulus stoically holds back his tears to set an example to his people, but later at the funeral he does show his grief, dutifulness and love for his brother amid the general mourning.

---

[33] See FRAZER III 233ff., BÖMER II 232f., LITTLEWOOD 1981 392f., FANTHAM 1998 151f.

[34] For further Virgilian reminiscences see p. 127 n. 58.

This is an unorthodox account,[35] and what is elsewhere an ugly story of sibling rivalry and greed for power (with Romulus killing Remus in a bitter fight over who won the contest of the birds or in an angry reaction to Remus' leap over the walls) here acquires a novel melancholy flavour and becomes a terrible misunderstanding. But, of course, Quirinus himself lies behind this account, and some may feel that he cannot be trusted, that he is trying too hard to exculpate himself and is going a bit over the top, depicting himself as almost totally innocent, a thoroughly nice person and loving brother, with heaven on his side and so on.[36] Then again this does mean branding mighty Quirinus (808) a liar. And, granted that Quirinus had to include the death of Remus, he could just have excused himself openly in a few lines and downplayed that aspect of the foundation, but here the fact that he devotes almost half of the passage (twenty-two out of fifty lines) to it makes it look as if this was something which affected him deeply and on which he lingers sorrowfully and regretfully. Also we are not just shown Romulus' grief (which helps his case), but at 853ff. we see the mourning of Faustulus, Acca and all the Romans, so that this seems like a tribute to Remus rather than a self-serving version of events. So we may feel that the sadness is genuine,[37] unless, that is, Quirinus is very clever and cunning. I think that all of this is meant to be an enigma for us.[38]

---

[35] In surviving literature Celer (rather than Romulus) is first mentioned as the killer of Remus by Dio. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 1.87.4, who explicitly states that this version is less probable. Perhaps we are to imagine that Quirinus knows of the tradition that puts the blame on him and is here putting the record straight.

[36] Cf. HARRIES 1989 170f., HINDS 1992 144ff., BARCHIESI 1997 161, 163f. But their actual arguments do not convince me: Harries surely exaggerates when he talks of Romulus' lament with its lyricism and personal tenderness seeming embarrassingly overdone, so that Romulus is utterly unbelievable; Hinds' claim that 4.848 encourages disquiet about Romulus' conduct is mystifying to me; and Barchiesi's allegation of hypocrisy in Romulus' grief based on Virgilian and Catullan reminiscences in 4.840 and 850 seems over-subtle and fanciful.

[37] On the pathos cf. KRÄMER.

[38] So too Ovid himself earlier at *F.* 2.143 said that Remus had grounds for accusing Romulus, which seemed then to mean that he had killed him, but now might mean that he bore some responsibility via Celer.

5.11ff. (Polyhymnia)

At 5.7ff. Ovid returns to the Muses, for the derivation of *Maius* ('May'), but unexpectedly they disagree among themselves this time (whereas before Erato had spoken for them all), and now (at 11ff.) we find an account that is indubitably flawed and a narrator who is clearly unreliable. Polyhymnia (the first of the Muses to respond to Ovid's request for information) tells how after the creation the gods did not yield to one another and none knew their proper place until Majesty was born, whereupon the gods acquired respect for rank. That state of affairs continued until Saturn was deposed, at which point Earth gave birth to the Giants, who attacked Jupiter. He defeated them with his thunderbolts, thereby defending Majesty. She sits beside Jupiter as his most faithful guardian, and also visited earth, where she was worshipped by Romulus, Numa and others.

Polyhymnia tries to build up her derivation of *Maius* by devoting quite a few lines to it and by giving prominence to themes (such as the creation and the battle of the Giants) that are redolent of Hesiod and epic poetry.[39] But there are patent errors. For instance, in line 11 she speaks as if there were only three elements (it looks as if the daughter of Mnemosyne has forgotten air).[40] This goddess confuses the Giants with Cottus, Briareus and Gyes (and gives them a thousand rather than a hundred hands) at 37f. and with the Aloadae at 39f.[41] In 45 she describes Majesty as Jupiter's most faithful guardian, which flies right in the face of what has just preceded (especially 43, where Majesty is defended by the arms of the gods). On top of all that Polyhymnia simply does not explain the derivation and does not specify how Majesty is connected with May (was she born in May, or defended in May, or did she come to earth in May, or what?). Thus the whole point of the narrative is omitted.[42]

Not only is this Muse comically inept but at 53f. Clio and Thalia actually approve of this derivation. All of this parodies the topos of the invocation of the Muses in general and the conversation with the

---

[39] Cf. BOYD 2000 68.

[40] Cf. SCHILLING 1993 II 136.

[41] Admittedly such confusion is found elsewhere, but it has real point here if it is meant as a mistake. The thousand hands are certainly an error.

[42] Pointedly the next speaker does spell out the etymological connection in her explanation, at 73.

Muses in Callimachus' *Aetia* in particular. There is also wit in the way in which the disagreement of the Muses in 9 is followed at once by a passage about deities not yielding to each other and the battle between the gods and the Giants. And there is (unconscious) humour in 19f. (where there are plebeian gods, who plonk themselves down on Saturn's throne), 21 (no god takes the outer side of Oceanus, who of course surrounds the land masses of the earth), 29f. (where the gods begin aping Majesty as soon as they see her) and 42 (which conjures up a veritable avalanche of Giants). In addition, if a Muse in these verses can be so obviously in error, Ovid is mischievously implying that poetry can be dubious and is capable of falsehoods[43] especially in the areas of scholarship and aetiology, before jauntily moving on to further scholarly *aetia*. Nothing is sacred to Ovid, and hereby he is of course also, rather hearteningly, poking fun at himself. The process continues in the next group of lines to be considered.

5.81ff. (Calliope)

As a lively way of putting across the fact that there are various explanations of the name *Maius*, Ovid next progresses to two more derivations by Muses. The second one (by Urania at 55ff.), which links the name with *maiores* ('ancestors'), is followed by another one which involves a narrative with a Hesiodic flavour and which will not convince many readers, but this time more because of excessive packaging.[44] At 5.81ff. Calliope says:

duxerat Oceanus quondam Titanida Tethyn,
  qui terram liquidis, qua patet, ambit aquis;
hinc sata Pleione cum caelifero Atlante
  iungitur, ut fama est, Pleiadasque parit.
quarum Maia suas forma superasse sorores 85
  traditur et summo concubuisse Iovi.
haec enixa iugo cupressiferae Cyllenes
  aetherium volucri qui pede carpit iter;
Arcades hunc Ladonque rapax et Maenalos ingens
  rite colunt, luna credita terra prior. 90

---

[43] Cf. *Amores* 3.12. At various points in the *Fasti* Ovid seems to be sending up scholarship, both his own and that of others (e.g. mythographers with their various versions and etymologists with their different derivations).

[44] Note also that Ovid had already accepted Urania's explanation of *Maius* at 1.41.

exul ab Arcadia Latios Evander in agros
  venerat, impositos attuleratque deos.
hic, ubi nunc Roma est, orbis caput, arbor et herbae
  et paucae pecudes et casa rara fuit.
quo postquam ventum est, 'consistite', praescia mater 95
  'nam locus imperii rus erit istud' ait.
et matri et vati paret Nonacrius heros,
  inque peregrina constitit hospes humo;
sacraque multa quidem, sed Fauni prima bicornis
  has docuit gentes alipedisque dei. 100
semicaper, coleris cinctutis, Faune, Lupercis,
  cum lustrant celebres verbera secta vias;
at tu materno donasti nomine mensem,
  inventor curvae, furibus apte, fidis.
nec pietas haec prima tua est: septena putaris, 105
  Pleiadum numerum, fila dedisse lyrae.

> Oceanus, whose flowing waters surround the broad earth, once married the Titaness Tethys. Their daughter Pleione, as the story goes, had intercourse with sky-bearing Atlas and gave birth to the Pleiades. Of these Maia, so it is said, surpassed her sisters in beauty and went to bed with almighty Jupiter. On a ridge of cypress-bearing Cyllene she gave birth to the one who speeds through the air on winged feet. He is duly worshipped by the Arcadians and sweeping Ladon and huge Maenalus—that land believed to antedate the moon. Evander came as an exile from Arcadia to the territory of Latium with his gods on board his ship. Here, where now stands Rome, the capital of the world, there were trees, grass, some livestock and the occasional hut. After they arrived here, his prophetic mother said: 'Settle [here]. For an empire will be located in this rustic spot.' The Nonacrian [i.e. Arcadian] hero obeyed his mantic mother and settled as a guest/stranger in this foreign land; he taught its peoples *many* rites but above all those of the two-horned Faunus and the wing-footed god. Demigoat Faunus, you are worshipped by the Luperci in their loin-cloths when the strips of hide purify the packed streets. But you, inventor of the curved lyre, patron of thieves, gave a month your mother's name; and this was not your first act of devotion: you are believed to have given the lyre seven strings, equivalent in number to the Pleiades.

The actual derivation (*Maius* from Maia) comes towards the end and could have been given as briefly as that, but this goddess is a competitor, and quite a performer at that—glib, learned (to the point of rather irritating pedantry) and showy, but not so smooth that one cannot see through her performance. She dresses things up even more than Polyhymnia did. The first eight lines, with their arresting flurry of couplings, present a catalogue of divine births reminiscent of the *Theogony*, carefully bringing out the exceptional qualities of all these divinities, and working in some rare and impressive compound adjectives (and spondeiazons) in 83 and 87. Actually all this is hardly relevant, but Calliope is using a mass of *doctrina* (learning) to bolster her case. In the rest of her verses the basic point is that Arcadian Evander introduced into Latium the worship of Mercury, who named *Maius* after his mother Maia, but that obviously struck Calliope as too bald, so she adds lots of padding. At 89f. there are more names and the detail of Arcadia antedating the moon, and at 91–8 there are a full eight lines to say that Evander came from Arcadia to Latium, but of course Ovid already knew all this, so that the expansion here seems particularly unnecessary and gross.[45] The Muse also tries to impress in 97 with yet another erudite periphrasis (*Nonacrius heros*) and the snappy *et matri et vati*. At 99–102 there is more gratuitous learning (Faunus is quite beside the point and Ovid had already written himself about the Luperci).[46] And even when we finally get the derivation at 103ff. Calliope cannot resist rounding it all off with a few more bits of scholarship.

It is a droll touch to make a goddess of poetry so keen to impress the mortal poet, and again an incompetent performance[47] receives approbation from two other Muses (107f.). But all Calliope's efforts go for nothing, as Ovid at 109f. diplomatically refuses to choose between the three contenders, in case he alienates any of these important divinities.

5.195ff. (Flora)

At 5.191 Ovid poses another awkward question (he asks Flora who she is), but Flora gives the impression of being less embarrassed than Erato was and at 195ff. readily explains that she had been a nymph, but was raped by Zephyrus, who then married her, made her the goddess of flowers and gave her a marvellous garden filled with blossoms. We are back to a narrator talking about herself, but for the first time in these narratives this speaker seems to be rather sensitive about her status.

---

[45] See 1.469ff. This is a witty instance of self-imitation (cf. 5.639ff.).

[46] 2.267ff.

[47] Calliope also has her drawbacks as a narrator in *Met.* 5: cf. ANDERSON 525f., 533ff.

Flora does seem to be characterized as a chatterbox who runs on and on (especially, and not surprisingly, about flowers), but in the midst of her flood of words she does also seem to be concerned about her rank and what people think of her. So later at 297 she says that we gods are affected by the honour shown to us by people and delight in festivals and offerings, while at 311ff. she tells how insulted she felt and how much she resented being neglected by the Roman senate. And here she gets across some significant points: she is beautiful (199f.), she is married to a god (200, 205, 206, 209, 211; note the repetition for stress), she has another god for her brother-in-law (203), she is happily married (206), she has a wonderful paradise of a garden (207ff.) and she is the goddess of flowers (212). In the following narrative, as we will see, she tries to enhance her standing, and after that she informs Ovid how her province goes beyond flowers (261ff.) and links herself, on an equal footing, with Jupiter and other deities (297ff.). Obviously Flora wants Ovid and his readers (mere mortals!) to realize that she is not just one of those many nymphs who had a sexual experience with a god and nothing more: she got married to the god and became a full and important goddess in her own right.[48] All of this may well have a bearing on the absence of any complaint in connection with the rape (criticism of her husband would detract from her own position) and her actual description of the rape in 201f. (*ver erat, errabam; Zephyrus conspexit, abibam;/ insequitur, fugio: fortior ille fuit* 'it was spring, I was wandering; Zephyrus caught sight of me, I moved off; he pursued, I fled; he was stronger'), which is unspecific enough to help her maintain her dignity.

There are more instances of quirky humour in this passage. At 199f. Flora simultaneously claims that she is modest and also conveys the notion that she is very beautiful: *quae fuerit mihi forma, grave est narrare modestae;/ sed generum matri repperit illa deum* ('it goes against my modesty to describe my beauty, but it did win my mother a god for her son-in-law'). At 201f. (quoted above) it would appear that Zephyrus was a fast worker, aptly enough for a wind. At 203f. Flora maintains that because his brother Boreas had carried off Oreithyia Zephyrus had been given full right to rape her (a bizarre argument, especially for a victim, but this one is concerned about appearances). In 210 she tells how her garden is fanned by a breeze (not surprising for a garden given as a dowry by Zephyrus). I also wonder if Ovid does not open Flora's speech with a joke: after stating in 192 that the goddess is the best source for her own name, and in spite of the fact that it is obviously linked with *flos* = 'flower', and regardless of his own connection of the goddess with flowers twice (at 183 and 194), at 195f. he has her come out with the suspect identification of Flora with Chloris (supposedly her original name, in which the Greek chi had been corrupted into f).[49]

---

[48] This still leaves her as a parvenu, and it is noticeable that Juno addresses her as 'nymph' in 246 below. For such a divine pecking-order cf. Aeolus and Juno, and Neptune and the winds in Virgil *Aeneid* 1. 76ff. and 131ff.

5.231ff. (Flora)

Flora provides a second narrative at 5.231ff., telling how when Juno was irritated by Jupiter's production of Minerva on his own, Flora gave Juno a flower which made her pregnant with Mars. Complementing 5.195ff., again there is humour and a story with a sexual slant, aptly so for the goddess of the playful and saucy Floralia (cf. 183). Reinforcing the characterization of Flora, again Ovid presents her as verbose and bothered about the impression she makes. But this time she tries even harder to puff herself and there is a distinct possibility that she is lying.

Ovid had asked Flora to explain who she was, and she had done that by 214 (the end of the last narrative), but after that she ran on about her garden and all its flowers, and here she adds a somewhat gratuitous story about the properties of one flower in particular. It is natural for the goddess of flowers to be so enthusiastic about one of them, but this tale also represents Flora as a real somebody, in touch with top divinities, helping the queen of the gods and outwitting the king of the gods despite the danger to her in doing that, and also behind the birth of Mars himself (all very impressive for a Roman readership). She could have told her tale in just a few couplets but instead she goes on for thirty lines, in her usual chatty fashion, but also making much of a minor incident and her role in it (she is the one who comes to the assistance of Juno on her urgent quest for a means to become pregnant without Jupiter, for which she is prepared to scour earth, sea and the Underworld, and she possesses a plant with miraculous powers and mysterious origins). However, a flower with such a property is perhaps intrinsically a little improbable, and it is rather a coincidence that Juno while on her way to complain to Oceanus should bump into Flora who has just what she needs. Also one cannot help wondering why Flora would have been in such great danger from Jupiter as she claims (twice, for emphasis, at 230 and 248f.), why Jupiter should care particularly if Juno produced a child on her own, especially as he had just done precisely that himself with Minerva, and, if Flora was really so frightened of retribution, why she would tell the story to Ovid for him to make it public. In addition, there is no parallel anywhere in ancient literature for this version of the birth of Mars, which may mean that we are specially privileged to hear the unsuspected truth or that Flora has made the whole thing up, to magnify herself and perhaps also to trick us playfully. It is all rather tantalizing.

---

[49] This may be intended to suggest from the start that one should not unthinkingly accept Flora's words at face value.

Also part of the entertainment is the notion of Mars owing his origins to a flower and the picture of Juno annoyed with Jupiter not for being unfaithful or fathering a bastard child but for producing a child on his own, and Juno engaged on this quaint tit for tat quest, and ready to range over the whole world not in order to persecute enemies but to find a way of getting pregnant on her own. And there is wit in making Flora the narrator: she, who had no complaint about being raped, speaks of Juno complaining because of the absence of intercourse (233); the possessor of a fertile garden (209) explains how she made Juno fertile with a product of her garden; and this pacific goddess recounts how she helped create the god of war.[50]

5.451ff. (Mercury)

At 5.445ff. Ovid claims that the origin of the name of the Lemuria escapes him and turns to Mercury for help. He duly passes on an account stimulated by that god at 451ff. (adding at 481f. that Remuria was corrupted to Lemuria):

---

[50] For a few more diverting touches here see SCHMITZER 156f.

Romulus ut tumulo fraternas condidit umbras,
  et male veloci iusta soluta Remo,
Faustulus infelix et passis Acca capillis
  spargebant lacrimis ossa perusta suis;
inde domum redeunt sub prima crepuscula maesti,
  utque erat, in duro procubuere toro.
umbra cruenta Remi visa est adsistere lecto,
  atque haec exiguo murmure verba loqui:
'en ego dimidium vestri parsque altera voti,
  cernite sim qualis, qui modo qualis eram!
qui modo, si volucres habuissem regna iubentes,
  in populo potui maximus esse meo,
nunc sum elapsa rogi flammis et inanis imago:
  haec est ex illo forma relicta Remo.
heu ubi Mars pater est? si vos modo vera locuti,
  uberaque expositis ille ferina dedit.
quem lupa servavit, manus hunc temeraria civis
  perdidit. o quanto mitior illa fuit!
saeve Celer, crudelem animam per volnera reddas,
  utque ego, sub terras sanguinulentus eas.
noluit hoc frater, pietas aequalis in illo est:
  quod potuit, lacrimas in mea fata dedit.
hunc vos per lacrimas, per vestra alimenta rogate
  ut celebrem nostro signet honore diem.'
mandantem amplecti cupiunt et bracchia tendunt:
  lubrica prensantes effugit umbra manus.
ut secum fugiens somnos abduxit imago,
  ad regem voces fratris uterque ferunt.
Romulus obsequitur, lucemque Remuria dicit
  illam, qua positis iusta feruntur avis.

When Romulus consigned his brother's ghost to a tomb and the last rites were duly performed for the fatally nimble Remus, miserable Faustulus and Acca with her hair unbound sprinkled the cremated bones with their tears. Then they sadly returned home just before dusk and collapsed on their hard bed, just as it was. They dreamed that Remus' blood-stained ghost stood at the bedside and in a faint murmur said: 'Look at me—the other half of your hopes; see what I am, compared with what I was just now. Just now, if I had got the birds that prescribed the kingship, I could have been pre-eminent among my people. Now I am an insubstantial phantom that has slipped away from the pyre's flames; this form is what remains of the well-known Remus. Ah, where is Mars, my father (if, that is, you told the truth and he provided the wild animal's teats for the exposed babies)? I, who was saved by a she-wolf, have been killed by a fellow citizen's reckless hand. Oh, how much more gentle she was! Savage Celer, may you yield up your cruel spirit as a result of wounds and pass beneath

> the earth covered in blood, like me! My brother didn't want this, his devotion matches mine: he wept for my fate (all that he could do). Beg him by your tears, by your fosterage to designate a festal day in my honour.' As he gave these instructions, they longed to embrace him and stretched out their arms; the elusive ghost slipped from their grasping hands. When the spectre fled, taking their sleep with it, they both reported to the king his brother's words. Romulus complied and gave the name Remuria to the day on which buried ancestors receive the worship due to them.

This is the first time that one of these narratives returns to the topic of an earlier one, and maddeningly it only increases the enigma about the trustworthiness of Quirinus' claim of innocence in respect of Remus' death (4.809ff.). At first sight there is strong corroboration here, by Remus himself, and by Mercury (whose authority had been underscored at 446ff., where he appeared as a god, in particular one connected with the Underworld, and a revered figure with his powerful *caduceus*). But, of course, Mercury could be in collusion with his fellow god Quirinus. In addition, Mercury in myth did lie over his theft of Apollo's cattle and appears later in the *Fasti* as a god amused by such theft and by perjury.[51] Then again he might be telling the truth this time. But in any case Ovid is only pretending that Mercury inspired him, isn't he?

However, some things are clear. Such an inspirer with his divine knowledge and Underworld connection provides a brand new addendum to Remus' death by going on to his ghost. He also thereby retells the story from a new perspective, one which gives unusual prominence to Remus and a rare development of Remus' character. Here the man is bitter over his death, rueful about lost opportunities and his present state, reproachful to his father for not saving him, angry with Celer for killing him, and so forth. This is all very emotional and realistic, and here for the first time Remus acquires a strong personality and we see the impact on *him* of the murder and grasp its full tragedy. While reading Remus' words it is not too hard (especially in view of 461f. and material earlier in the *Fasti*) to see implicit contrast with Romulus, who not only lived on, as king, but also went on to perform glorious deeds, and was deified. The sombre impact of that speech is complemented by the sad start of the narrative (the funeral, misery and mourning, and the state of Remus' ghost) and by the futile attempt to embrace the ghost at 475f., prior to the diminuendo close. Nowhere else do we find such a highly developed pathos with reference to Remus' demise.

---

[51] See 5.691f. and cf. BARCHIESI 1997 121 and NEWLANDS 120.

5.639ff. (Tiber)

At 5.635ff., after two possible explanation of why rush dummies are thrown into the Tiber by a Vestal Virgin, Ovid turns to the Tiber himself for the reason, but only as an imaginative way of intimating that there is also another explanation but it is not trustworthy. Here the narrator is manifestly unreliable, but this time that notion is conveyed by means of a sudden deflating effect and the unreliability is due to mental deficiency.

One would expect the Tiber to be an expert on this rite, and Ovid plays on that expectation at 635f., where he says that because of its great antiquity (older even than Rome) the river could well know the origin of the custom. At 637f., with a seemingly solemn reminiscence of Virgil *Aeneid* 8.31ff., the Tiber raises his reed-crowned head from mid-stream and begins to talk. Initially (very much like an old man) he seems discursive, reminiscing about the distant past of the region, dwelling on himself somewhat and rather proud of his present eminence, but modest enough about his humble origins. However, his memory seems good, especially when in an apparently purposeful manner he goes on to relate how Evander arrived there from Arcadia, and then Alcides (Hercules) with some Greek companions. But then suddenly in 646 he remarks: *Albula, si memini, tunc mihi nomen erat* ('at that time, if I remember right, my name was Albula'). One is brought up short and forced to wonder how accurate his version of what happened then is likely to be if he cannot even be sure of his own name at that time.[52] This disquiet is reinforced by what follows. He goes on to say that after Hercules killed Cacus and went off with Geryon's cattle, his companions (mainly from Argos) stayed behind but missed their home, and as one of them died he commanded his heir to throw his ashes into the Tiber so that they could be conveyed to the Inachian land (i.e. Argos, or

---

[52] Cf. RUTLEDGE 75. The presence of *si* ('if') militates against taking this line as an 'Alexandrian footnote' (as some scholars do).

Greece), but the heir instead buried him there and threw a rush dummy into the river, so that it would float back to his home in Greece, and that was the origin of the rite. This raises a lot of questions. How could the dying man call the river 'Tiber' at that point, if its name was Albula? How would ashes thrown into the Tiber not just be dissipated and get all the way round to Argos or Greece? Why would the heir throw a rush dummy into the river instead of the ashes, and why would he assume that it would end up in Argos or Greece? How exactly did the heir's action engender a Roman ritual involving a Vestal Virgin? The ascription of the name Tiber at that point is an obvious slip by the narrator. As for the ashes and dummies, this (river) god would seem to see no anomaly there, and may be guilty of garbling. Any link with Rome and the Vestal Virgin is simply passed over. There are various possible reasons for all this (e.g. the Tiber may be simply not very bright), but Ovid stressed his great age just before he spoke (at 635). So one particular explanation seems both obvious and likely, when someone is so old and unfocussed and prone to lapses of memory: the venerable Tiber is senile (a typically flippant and irreverent touch).

5.699ff. (Mercury)

Ringing the changes, at 5.699ff. Ovid takes us from the bumbling Tiber to the cool and clinically efficient Mercury (who is very different from the earlier rather human and often comic narrators and inspirers, and who produces an unemotional narrative that contrasts markedly with the pathetic 5.451ff. on Remus' ghost).

Mercury tells how Castor and Pollux fought with Lynceus and Idas (after the former had abducted the latter's formally betrothed fiancées), how Castor, Lynceus and Idas were killed, and how Pollux rescued his brother from death by offering to share his immortality with him, whereupon the two became stars (the Twins). Mercury is a neat choice as narrator for such a tale (a god himself and the son of one of the Pleiades, the killer of Argus, and the escort of the dead). His own background helps to explain the absence of any condemnation here (he was himself a rapist and thief and found the breaking of contracts amusing,[53] Castor and Pollux were fellow gods, and Pollux was, like Mercury, a son of Jupiter). But, more than that, Mercury shows no emotion towards anyone in this episode (not even towards Castor and Pollux), is very detached in his description of the abduction and deaths, and produces an account that is factual and not at all coloured (with no attempt to exonerate Castor and Pollux, blacken Lynceus and Idas, arouse sympathy for the sisters, wonder at the stellification etc.). Unpredicatable as ever, Ovid is here stressing the otherness of this remote and rather chilly divine narrator.

---

[53] Cf. e.g. 2.611ff., 5.691f. (just before this passage). Again this means that we cannot automatically trust every aspect of the god's version (cf. HARRIES 1989 179f.).

Something that contributes to the feeling of distance is the polish of these lines. The god of eloquence (cf. *facundo . . . ore* in 698) opens with a flourish (piling up alliteration, assonance, repetition, juxtaposition and extensive balance and contrast, especially in connection with various pairs) at 699ff.:

> abstulerant raptas Phoeben Phoebesque sororem
> Tyndaridae fratres, hic eques, ille pugil. 700
> bella parant repetuntque suas et frater et Idas,
> Leucippo fieri pactus uterque gener.
> his amor ut repetant, illis ut reddere nolint,
> suadet; et ex causa pugnat uterque pari.

> The Tyndarid brothers (one a horseman, the other a boxer) had seized and carried off Phoebe and Phoebe's sister. Idas and his brother (who had both made an agreement to become sons-in-law to Leucippus) prepared for battle and went to get their women back. Love prompted one pair to get them back and the other pair to refuse to return them, and each pair fought because of a similar motive.

After that flashy opening Mercury gets down to the action, structuring it elegantly and efficiently. Following on from the above three couplets (one each on the rapists, their opponents, and the motivation of both pairs) come a couplet on the decision to fight (705f.) and a couplet on the location of the fight (707f.); then there are three couplets on the actual fight (one each for the deaths of Castor, Lynceus and Idas) and another three on the rescue of Castor and the stellification. This really is all rather frigid and alien.

6.485ff. (Bacchus)

At 6.485ff. the inspirer Bacchus also shows himself to be a skilful raconteur, but in this case the tale is very lively, warm and engaging. The subject is Bacchus' own aunt Ino, who brought him up as an infant, and uniquely in such narratives his (naturally partial) account inverts an earlier one by Ovid himself (3.853ff., with its much darker picture of Ino).[54]

The lines sweep along with liberty and latitude (rather than being tightly controlled), and contain lots of movement, change and incident (including a flurry of action in 549f. at the end). The focalizer's own obvious involvement encourages the reader's involvement.[55] He gains impact by means of a simple and strong contrast between the victim Ino and the oppressor Juno, arousing great sympathy for the former and hatred for the latter (especially at 485, 489ff. and 507ff.). This caring aunt (486), for looking after the infant Bacchus, her own flesh and blood (488), is savagely and vindictively persecuted by the queen of heaven herself. First Ino's husband is driven mad and murders his little son Learchus, to the great grief of Ino; and then she herself is maddened and tries to kill her surviving son (Melicertes) by leaping into the sea from the Isthmus of Corinth. However, sea nymphs rescue the mother and child, and they eventually reach the mouth of the Tiber. There Ino learns from some bacchantes that Evander is king, but she has still not escaped the relentless Juno, who now insidiously alters her appearance, persuades the bacchantes that this stranger is trying to find out about their secret rites and gets them to attack her and tear her son away from her. She screams out for help, and Hercules (passing through with the cattle of Geryon) comes and rescues her. When he asks if she is being assailed by Juno too, she tells him part of her story, touchingly repressing some of it in the presence of her little boy, and ashamed at the crime that she had tried to commit while mad. Finally she makes it to the home of Carmentis, where she is given food (after having none and being hungry for a long time) and is told by her that her labours are finally over and she and her son will become sea divinities, and this prediction comes true. After all the emotional ups and downs and all the suspense[56] there is a real sense of relief and triumph in this happy ending.

---

[54] On this inversion see p. 151.

[55] Comparison with *Met.*4.416ff. (narrated by Ovid *in propria persona*) is instructive: by way of contrast Bacchus makes his aunt the protagonist and main focus of the story and goes for pathos rather than sensationalism and horror.

[56] PARKER 338f. points out that there is no parallel for everything that happens after Ino hits the water off the Isthmus of Corinth. So we have from then on very rare or entirely original action which would have aroused tension in readers.

The selection of Bacchus as inspirer is effective in many other ways too. There is appropriateness in putting him behind a tale in which frenzy, bacchantes, another bastard son of Jupiter and deification feature. There is also point, piquancy and irony: Bacchus was himself a victim of Juno, was driven mad by her and made to wander the earth;[57] and implicit but clear disapproval of Juno's activities is ascribed to one who was personally capable of savagery, drove the Theban bacchantes mad, setting them on Pentheus, and was responsible for the Minyades murdering a child and Lycurgus and the Argive women killing their own offspring.[58]

6.657ff. (Minerva)

At 6.651ff. Ovid wonders why at the Lesser Quinquatrus flute-players wander through the whole city, why they have masks and why they wear long gowns. He appeals for help to Minerva, who tells him (at 657ff.) that in ancient times the flute was originally very popular at Rome, and was played in temples and at games and funerals. A period followed which wrecked the practice of flute-playing (661f.). Also an aedile restricted the number of flautists accompanying a funeral procession to ten. The flute-players went off into exile at Tibur, and the flute was greatly missed in the theatre, at altars and at funerals in Rome. An ex-slave at Tibur invited the flautists to a banquet and got them drunk, and then had a messenger turn up, pretend that the ex-slave's former master was coming and tell them all to break up the party. The drunken flute-players were loaded on to a wagon and driven off, back to Tibur they thought, and they all soon fell asleep thanks to the wine and the motion. In fact the wagon took them back to Rome, and in the morning it stood in the middle of the forum. To deceive the senate over their faces and number, Plautius ordered them to wear masks, mixed others in with them and told them to wear long garments, so female flautists could be added to the band. He thought that in this way their return against his colleague's orders could be concealed. His plan found favour and now they are allowed to dress strangely and sing out playful words at the Lesser Quinquatrus.

---

[57] Diod. Sic. 3.62, Apollod. *Bibl.* 3.5.1ff.

[58] *Met.* 4.428f., Apollod. *Bibl.* 3.5.1f., Aelian *Var. Hist.* 3.42.

When I first read this account I found it disappointing—rather dry and dull, and also unclear. Having re-read it many times I still find it rather dry and dull, and also unclear. Dryness and dulness are admittedly subjective matters, but the lack of clarity is not. Minerva makes an unexceptionable start and seems to be a champion of the flute, accentuating how popular it was at first and how much it was missed after the exile of the flute players. But the point of 661f. is left unexplained (what exactly wrecked the practice?), and the progression to the next sentence in 663 seems abrupt. It has been suggested that there is a lacuna in the middle of 661 or at the end of 662, but in any case there are other difficulties. Minerva is vague over names (the aedile, the ex-slave and Plautius' colleague are all unnamed), and Plautius' standing is not explained (he was in fact a censor). Nor is there any explanation of why the arrival of the ex-slave's master should break up the banquet. When the flute-players are returned to Rome, we cannot tell whether Plautius is acting in collusion with the ex-slave or is just quick to react independently to the situation. Then too why is the senate hostile? Wouldn't people wonder why there were characters in masks wandering around? Who are the female flautists, and why didn't they go off to Tibur too? How does the return of the flute-players against the orders of Plautius' colleague square with their voluntary exile? And how precisely was the whole affair resolved? The problems and obscurity stand out even more when the above version is compared with those in Livy and Plutarch, which do not have such holes and are much easier to follow.[59]

Even Homer nods, and perhaps even Ovid does; but for so long? There is an explanation for all this which gives the lines the kind of bite and wit that one expects from our poet. I believe that here, as another innovation (and a bold one), we are presented with a narrator who is not particularly interested in the narrative requested of her. Minerva, of course, threw away the flute which she had invented when she saw how playing it disfigured her face (and in case we have forgotten that story or do not readily make the application of it here, Ovid includes it right after this at 699ff.). Ovid would appear to be having fun with a flute-playing festival for a goddess for whom the flute had unpleasant associations. So it seems that she can't really get her heart into telling this story properly, and it is noticeable that she never does bother to answer Ovid's first question (why the flautists wander through the whole city). This would be a risky move on Ovid's part, but readers should be perplexed by the vague and rather pedestrian nature of the lines and then be amused and rather abashed when they finally catch on. Contributing to the fun, there is the tease of Minerva initially seeming to be favourable to the flute, and then comes the joke of all the vagueness on the part of a learned goddess (656, right before, reminds us of this) talking about her own festival. Such humour is perfectly in keeping with the *verba iocosa* ('playful words', 692) that are part of this festival, and it is developed further in the following narrative.

---

[59] Livy 9.30.5ff., Plutarch *Quaest. Rom.* 55.

6.697ff. (Minerva)

Ovid proceeds to ask Minerva why the Quinquatrus is so named. She replies that a festival of hers is celebrated under that name in March and flautists are connected with one of her inventions. She adds at 697ff.:

> prima, terebrato per rara foramina buxo,
>   ut daret, effeci, tibia longa sonos.
> vox placuit: faciem liquidis referentibus undis
>   vidi virgineas intumuisse genas. 700
> 'ars mihi non tanti est; valeas, mea tibia' dixi:
>   excipit abiectam caespite ripa suo.
> inventam satyrus primum miratur, et usum
>   nescit, et inflatam sentit habere sonum;
> et modo dimittit digitis, modo concipit auras, 705
>   iamque inter nymphas arte superbus erat:
> provocat et Phoebum. Phoebo superante pependit;
>   caesa recesserunt a cute membra sua.

> By piercing boxwood with a few holes I was the first to make the flute produce music. The sound was pleasing. In clear water that reflected my face I saw that my virgin cheeks had become swollen. 'The art isn't worth that much to me. Goodbye, my flute,' I said, and threw it away; it landed on the turf of a river bank. A satyr found it and at first wondered at it, ignorant of its use, and realized that it could make a sound when he blew into it; while fingering it, he alternately expelled and drew in air. And now because of his skill he swaggered among the nymphs; he also challenged Phoebus. Phoebus won, the satyr was hung up and the skin was stripped and flayed from his body.

She appends two more lines at 709f., saying that she is the inventor of flute music and that is why the profession observes her holy days.

Ovid was talking about the Lesser Quinquatrus (on June 12th) but Minerva (not really paying attention, it seems) talks about the Greater Quinquatrus (in March).[60] Ovid asked her about the origin of the name of the festival, but Minerva starts her narrative with her invention of the flute, then rambles on about the satyr Marsyas, still further off the point, and never does get around to answering the question. This is a (novel) degeneration from the last exchange, where she did respond to two of the three queries and did produce an account that was relevant (if vague), and for only the second time a narrator does not satisfy at all a request for information. Perhaps we are to assume that she is now really losing interest in all this flute festival business and is making a merely token reply (this speech is much shorter than the last one). Perhaps this learned goddess does not actually know the derivation of the name of her own festival (unlike Ovid, who explained it himself earlier at 3.809f.) and is trying to cloak her ignorance with a bit of bull.

Readers are tantalized not only about the origin of Quinquatrus but also in connection with Marsyas: one would expect a divininity who was herself insolently challenged (by Arachne) to relish the punishment of the satyr, and at 703–6 she seems to be producing a detailed and full account, so that at 707 expectations rise as she gets to the climax, only for her to skim the actual flaying (the high point of the whole story) in 708.[61] It is also a pawky touch to make the inventor of the flute (and the person in whose honour the flautists parade) here briskly write off the instrument and come out with a series of increasingly negative anecdotes (after the exile, the rejection of the invention, and Marsyas), implying that she never did like the flute and it has been responsible for so much trouble, and thereby undermining this whole section of the poem on the festival (6.651–710). That is quite a note on which to go out. Ovid makes no response, and should quite possibly be imagined to be speechless.

---

[60] Her inadequacy here is underscored by the contrast with the Greater Quinquatrus at 3.809ff., where we saw a very different Minerva—a serious and rather frightening goddess, patroness of various craftsmen (in opposition to her lack of craftsmanship here and in the previous narrative).

[61] Contrast *Met.* 6.383ff. and see further pp. 246f.

CHAPTER THREE

RAPE NARRATIVES

Among various sets of stories in the *Fasti* (tales about Romulus and Remus, stellification etc.) rape narratives[1] form a distinct and prominent group. They account for almost a fifth[2] of the mythical and legendary passages in the *Fasti*, and the two longest narratives in the poem are concerned with rapes (200 lines on Proserpine in the fourth book and 142 lines on Lucretia in book 2). They bulk large in the second book (where there are four of them), and elsewhere they are placed in conspicuous positions (as the first narratives in books 3 and 6, and the central one in the first book). There are also many memorable touches to highlight them further—for example, the vivid picture of Priapus massively erect in the moonlight, the humour of Faunus mistakenly trying to rape Hercules and the pathos of Lara's mute and futile appeal to Mercury for mercy.[3] Yet despite their obvious significance the rapes in the *Fasti* have hardly been studied.[4] This chapter will cast new light on them, viewing this multifaceted group from several angles, and elucidating Ovid's dexterity as he employs them for various effects and retells the same type of tale in different ways.

---

[1] I include under 'rape' simply the actual or attempted perpetration of sexual intercourse without the other person's consent or willingness, where physical or non-physical coercion is involved. I use the term objectively (detached from emotional baggage) as much needed shorthand for all of that, and with no implication about whether or not Ovid would have viewed all the rapes in the *Fasti* as criminal or even objectionable acts, an issue which involves speculation irrelevant to my literary analysis (on the legal complexities cf. LAIOU 83ff. and DEACEY-PIERCE 1ff., 25ff., 176ff.). To qualify as a 'rape narrative' something more substantial than a brief allusion is required, i.e. a passage of more than ten lines that contains at least three 'functions' and two 'stages' (on which see below). Accordingly there are rape narratives in the *Fasti* at 1. 393ff. (Lotis), 2.155ff. (Callisto), 305ff. (Omphale), 585ff. (Juturna and Lara), 711ff. (Lucretia), 3.11ff. (Rhea Silvia), 4.419ff. (Proserpine), 5.195ff. (Flora), 605ff. (Europa), 6.105ff. (Cranae) and 321ff. (Vesta).

[2] 11 out of a total of 58.

[3] See 1.437f., 2.343ff., 613f.

[4] They are occasionally touched on in discussions of rapes in the *Metamorphoses* or Ovid in general: see PARRY, STIRRUP, CURRAN, WALL, RICHLIN 158–79 and DE LUCE. For investigation of rape elsewhere in antiquity cf. LAIOU, DEACEY-PIERCE, ROSIVACH 13ff., SCAFURO and OMITOWOJU.

A Feminist Approach

Such an approach[5] (and reaction to it) sharpens the picture with regard to victims and rapists, clarifies Ovidian economy and profitably directs attention to the important questions of tone and the poet's literary aims.

A focus on Ovid's treatment of the rape victim and her point of view provides an interesting perspective and yields a variety of insights. These females are only textually prominent and a major focus in seven out of twelve cases.[6] They tend to be beautiful and young (sometimes virginal), but except for Lucretia there is not much explicit physical description of them, and sometimes[7] there is none at all. Only seven of them have their words quoted, and in most instances their words occupy merely a line or two.[8] Their attitude to the rapists (beyond basic unwillingness) and to any recompense given is not much pursued; apart from Callisto and especially Lucretia, who both feel shame, they are not represented as humiliated or demeaned by the act of rape; Ovid does not have much to say about any unhappiness or suffering on their part,[9] and even makes a joke out of Europa's fear.[10] He shows sympathy only towards Callisto, Lara and Lucretia; with other victims he is either neutral or facetious.

The actual interpretation of this data is problematical. A feminist critic might well conclude that Ovid is just not very interested in the characters or feelings of these women and goddesses, and that he here exploits what is a serious crime, even trying inappropriately to make it into something funny.[11] There may be some truth in such conclusions;

---

[5] On feminist criticism and rape see especially HIGGINS-SILVER, RICHLIN, WYKE 267ff. and KEITH 102ff.

[6] I.e. Callisto, Lara, Lucretia, Rhea Silvia, Flora, Europa and Cranae.

[7] In the case of Juturna, Lara, Rhea Silvia and Vesta.

[8] The exceptions are Lucretia (13 lines), Rhea Silvia (12 lines) and (telling her own story) Flora with 20 lines. Callisto, Lara, Proserpine and Cranae have much less to say. On rape victims being denied a voice cf. DE LUCE.

[9] There are brief references to fear on the part of Lotis (1.435), Europa (5.608, 612) and Vesta (6.343), and Proserpine is briefly upset at 4.447f. Ovid is more detailed about Lucretia's terror, aporia and misery (2.797ff., 813ff.). For the girl's feelings as unimportant cf. ROSIVACH 38.

[10] At 5.608 and 611ff. Cf. RICHLIN 168ff. on enjoyment of the victim's fear.

[11] Some might claim on the basis of these accounts that Ovid was in general prejudiced against women. But (apart from the fact that he may well be reflecting the attitudes of his sources at various points here) it is not really valid to extrapolate his general views on the basis of such a small group of passages, without making allowance for his attitude elsewhere to women (he explores their psychology

but there is a danger of being simplistic and blinkered here. What follows is an attempt not to exonerate Ovid but to make due allowance for the various and very real complexities of this whole issue.

A focus on the rapist is also informative and a useful corrective. If the females are hardly developed and are often not conspicuous in the text, much the same is also true of the males.[12] They too are not given extensive characterization, apart from Sextus; they too are quite often not textually prominent or a major centre of attention,[13] and of those who do stand out in the narrative Sextus only arouses hatred for himself and sympathy for Lucretia, while the foiled rapists Jupiter (with Juturna and Europa), Faunus (with Omphale) and Priapus (with Lotis and Vesta) are utilized for mockery and are generally presented as ridiculous and even mortified figures. If many of the victims are denied a voice, even fewer of the rapists have their words quoted, and they have less to say than some of the females.[14] The female psyche may not be probed, but the male psyche isn't either, and in the main the gods and men are depicted simply as aroused predators.[15]

It is also important to take into account the literary side of things. Ovid decided to keep quite short nine of these eleven passages, which meant that he had to be economical. This would seem to be a major reason why he does little to develop or investigate most of his protagonists but instead employs them as narrative tools—tempting prey

---

and lets them speak in most of the *Heroides*, he takes their side in *A.A.* 3, and he shows sympathy towards many of them (e.g. Callisto) in the *Metamorphoses*).

[12] Note also that some of the victims do come alive, albeit briefly (Lucretia obviously, but also the dumb, pleading Lara, the gorgeous Omphale and the chatty, image-conscious Flora). And there is clear point in making the elusive Juturna and Vesta hardly figure in the narrative and in making Proserpine disappear from the text as she did from the earth.

[13] I.e. Jupiter in the Callisto story, Mercury in the Lara rape, Mars in connection with Rhea Silvia, and Dis (Proserpine).

[14] Faunus (re Omphale) gets a line and a half, Jupiter (in connection with Juturna) gets six lines, Sextus gets (a scattered) eleven and a half lines, and Janus (re Cranae) gets two lines.

[15] Words denoting love, desire, arousal and attraction are applied to ten of the twelve rapists (Ovid represents rape as erotic gratification rather than an act of domination or humiliation). Beyond bare lust and love, their feelings for the females are not explored, and no other motivation is mentioned. After the rape they sometimes show some sort of regard in the form of recompense (presumably Jupiter stellifies Callisto and has Europe named after Europa; Dis marries Proserpine; Zephyrus marries Flora and makes her goddess of flowers; Janus makes Cranae goddess of hinges).

and eager predators for the advancement of the story. These tales also need to be viewed within their overall context. Some of their primary uses in the *Fasti* are to entertain, to enliven learned and rather dry material, and to make memorable the divinities, festivals, cults and stars that they illustrate and explain (rather than to pass social comment, explore the treatment of women etc.). Sex, humour and variety would obviously be a great help with all of that. Ovid, with his usual versatility, went for a range of tones and attitudes; but in most cases he chose to be flippant. Although we with our own culture's values and preconceptions may find such frivolity regrettable, we should also recognize that, if humour is aimed at, then sadness, humiliation, suffering and too much concern for the victim would ruin the intended effect. And overall Ovid cannot be fairly accused of chauvinistic indifference to females: there is great pathos in his accounts of Callisto, Lara and Lucretia; the two longest rapes (and the longest narratives in the whole poem) are sympathetic to one victim (Lucretia) and the mother of another (Proserpine); and Ovid is clearly condemnatory of Mercury (in connection with the helpless Lara) and especially Sextus (who villainously assaults Lucretia). Ovid was obviously aware that rape could be brutal and deeply upsetting, but for literary (rather than ethical) considerations opted instead to go for a lighter touch most of the time.[16]

A Narratological Approach

Another fruitful way of looking at a narrative is to inspect plotting in it (which really helps one to take it apart, to isolate and scrutinize its separate components, and to perceive relative weighting, sharpness of focus and patterning). This becomes even more fruitful when one considers a narrative's plotting within the context of a group of similar narratives (the rapes in the *Fasti* and elsewhere in Ovid),[17] pinpointing regular and irregular elements.

---

[16] RICHLIN 170 sees an element of voyeurism in some of the rapes (e.g. the partial nudity of the nymphs at 1.407ff., and the stealthy approaches of the rapists to Lotis, Omphale and Vesta). However, these are all instances of Ovid mischievously hinting at a coming description of sexual activity only to withhold it (rather than nasty titillation *per se*); and generally Ovid does not dwell on the actual rapes themselves and is not explicit over the actual mechanics, so that there is little real eroticism.

[17] For this chapter I take into account all 31 rape narratives in Ovid but confine

V. Propp usefully broke stories down into 'functions'.[18] Briefly a 'function' is an action which is significant for the narrative as a whole, one which contributes to substantial movement from initial to final situation. These functions are the fundamental components of a tale,[19] and by isolating them one can strip a story down to its essentials.[20] Employing a modified version of this approach which takes into account recent refinements on Propp,[21] I have found that in Ovidian rapes 26 standard functions/groups of functions occur in three separate stages. No rape narrative contains all 26 functions/groups of functions, and not all of them have all three stages (although most of them do)—this is the overall pool of possibilities from which such accounts are constructed. The standard functions (which do not necessarily occur in the order presented below) and stages are as follows:

STAGE 1: PRELUDE (events immediately before the rape which bear directly on the rape)

- ARRIVAL (Victim and/or Rapist comes to scene of rape or abduction)[22]

---

my actual discussion to the *Fasti*. For analysis of plotting in the rapes in all of Ovid's works (especially the *Metamorphoses*) see MURGATROYD 2000. A random survey of a dozen mythological rapes in other Classical authors turned up the same stages and functions, suggesting that the schema that appears below in the main text will hold good for rapes generally (perhaps with a few minor modifications).

[18] See PROPP (originally published in Russian in 1928). There are, of course, other theories of plot (such as 'moves' and 'kernels' and satellites'), but they were not so productive for the purposes of this investigation. Interesting work with Propp's functions has been done by DUNDES 1964 and 1965 and REECE.

[19] Of course, these narratives are also filled out by material other than functions, such as setting, characterization, similes and aetiology (to give them clarity, colour, logical coherence etc.). So there is Rhea Silvia's dream at 3.27ff., which is unique in Ovidian rape narratives, marking out this event as something extraordinary, as well as bringing out the momentousness. Especially common in this connection (present in 9 cases) is what Propp called 'Initial Situation' (i.e. scene-setting and background before the functions begin), and it often plays an important role (e.g. at 6.105–118: see pp. 21f.).

[20] Ovid fleshes out and adds life to this skeleton by including items other than functions and also by giving a striking, lively or unusual expression to a function (e.g. the DISCOMFITURE of the Rapist at 1.437f., where Priapus is laughed at for his all too obvious state of readiness for sex, and APPEAL at 2.613, where Lara, who has had her tongue ripped out, begs Mercury not to rape her by means of a look rather than words).

[21] Especially the (neat and concise) grouping of functions, the construction of sequences and triadic structure: see SCHOLES 96ff., BREMOND, GREIMAS 1983 222ff. and AÉLION.

[22] The ARRIVAL can be implied, and the Victim and the Rapist can already be at the scene of the rape or abduction when the account commences.

- ATTRACTION (Rapist is attracted to Victim)
- VULNERABILITY (Victim becomes vulnerable, through weariness, going to sleep, discarding weapons, losing fear of Rapist)[23]
- PREPARATIONS (planning of rape, luring of Victim, assistance from Helper, disguising/composing/urging on of Rapist)

STAGE 2: CONTACT (actual implementation of the rape)

- PHYSICAL APPROACH (Rapist goes right up to Victim, Victim goes right up to Rapist)
- VULNERABILITY (Victim becomes vulnerable, through falling asleep, entering Rapist's domain, losing fear of Rapist)
- OVERTURES (Rapist makes overtures,[24] Victim rejects overtures)
- SEIZURE (Rapist seizes Victim)
- ABDUCTION (Rapist abducts Victim)
- FLIGHT (Victim flees, Rapist pursues, Victim escapes, Victim captured)
- APPEAL (Victim appeals for pity/help, Rapist appeals for help, appeal is successful/unsuccessful)
- RESISTANCE (Victim resists, Victim does not resist, resistance successful, resistance overcome or abandoned)
- CALMING (Rapist tries to calm Victim successfully/unsuccessfully)
- RAPE (rape takes place, rape is foiled)

STAGE 3: AFTERMATH (subsequent events directly linked to rape)

- DISCOMFITURE (Rapist repents or is ridiculed, Victim is persecuted or rejected by others)
- DEPARTURE (Victim departs, Rapist just leaves scene of rape (under no pressure) or flees or escapes those who would stop him)
- SEARCH (abducted Victim is searched for, Searcher receives help, search is successful/unsuccessful)
- DETECTION (rape is (temporarily) concealed, exposure of rape is threatened/attempted, rape is revealed/detected)
- REVENGE (revenge is taken on Rapist or Victim, revenge ends)
- PREGNANCY (Victim becomes pregnant, gives birth)
- RECONCILIATION (Victim becomes reconciled to Rapist)
- RECOMPENSE (Victim is recompensed, with marriage and/or a gift)

---

[23] This function can occur in Stage 2 also.

[24] Kisses, embraces, flattery, proposition, nods and signs, prayers, bribes, threats, wheedling, declaration of love, attempt to lure or impress.

- SUBSTITUTE UNION (in place of sexual intercourse there is some other form of union between Rapist and Victim)[25]
- DEATH (Rapist tries to kill himself/is killed, Victim commits suicide/is killed)
- NEW LIFE (Victim/Rapist is metamorphosed and has new life in new form)

So, to take a simple and well known example, the rape of Rhea Silvia by Mars during her sleep on the river bank at *Fasti* 3.9ff. can be stripped down to the following stages and functions. STAGE 1 PRELUDE: ARRIVAL (Victim comes to scene of rape at 11–13), VULNERABILITY (Victim becomes vulnerable by falling asleep at 17–20), ATTRACTION (Rapist is attracted to Victim in 21); STAGE 2 CONTACT: RAPE (rape takes place in 21); STAGE 3 AFTERMATH: DETECTION (rape is temporarily concealed at 22–5), PREGNANCY (Victim becomes pregnant and gives birth at 23f. and 41–8). Naturally there are other elements (such as the Victim's dream) to fill out the narrative, but the above represents a useful outline of the main events in the account.

One of the valuable things that this type of analysis does is highlight any skimming or omission in connection with functions and stages. In this context that is especially noticeable with regard to the RAPE function itself and has a variety of effects. So in the very long passage on Lucretia the actual RAPE is contained in one verse (2.810) and is in fact restricted to a single word (*succubuit* 'she submitted'), for the sake of decency and dignity, and in line with Lucretia's chastity (the pathos and horror are adequately conveyed by her subsequent reactions). In the even longer passage on Proserpine very unusually[26] RAPE does not figure at all, aptly enough as Proserpine (carried off by Dis) drops out of the story early on at 4.448 and for the rest of the account is off in the mysterious Underworld largely beyond the ken of her mother and the reader. In the frivolous lines on Europa, keeping up the levity, there is merely play on RAPE at 5.617 with *te, Sidoni, Iuppiter implet* 'Sidonian girl, Jupiter filled you' (where the verb primarily means 'made pregnant' but also seems to contain a graphic double entendre). With Rhea Silvia the RAPE function and the Contact stage are both confined to a single verse

---

[25] E.g. at *Met.* 1.548ff. and 705ff. Daphne becomes Apollo's tree and Syrinx becomes Pan's pipes.

[26] Elsewhere in such narratives in Ovid RAPE is omitted only at *Met.* 2.836ff.

(3.21: *Mars videt hanc visamque cupit potiturque cupita* 'Mars saw her and desired the one he saw and possessed the one he desired'). The brevity there stands out in contrast to the rather expansive preceding four lines on VULNERABILITY (as she falls asleep). In addition to keeping the tone light and generally suiting the impetuous god of war,[27] this minimizes Mars (see further below in the section on rape as subversion) and fits with his role here as a shadowy figure and a fast worker who operates undetected. In her version of her rape by Zephyrus (now her husband) Flora covers the first two stages and the functions ARRIVAL, ATTRACTION, FLIGHT and RAPE in a mere 2 lines with a flurry of verbs (5.201f.: *ver erat, errabam; Zephyrus conspexit, abibam;/ insequitur, fugio: fortior ille fuit* 'it was spring, I was wandering; Zephyrus caught sight of me, I moved off; he pursued, I fled: he was stronger'). As well as suggesting the actual speed of events (with the wind god as a swift and irresistible force of nature), the couplet shows a now reconciled Flora as keen to pass over the actual rape quickly (see pp. 50f.). With Cranae, after a full fourteen lines of preamble to provide background, the actual rape begins at 6.119, and all 3 stages and 6 functions are over by 130, in six fast-moving and action-packed couplets.

This kind of analysis also makes it clear that Ovid indulged in significant expansion too (resulting in emphasis and often affecting mood). In the lines on Lotis most space is given to the PHYSICAL APPROACH at 1.425ff., as Priapus advances towards the sleeping nymph on tiptoe and holding his breath, so as not to wake her. This seems aimed at humour, via the (graphic) undignified furtiveness of the god, and also builds anticipation (only to be frustrated when she is woken by the braying of Silenus' ass and makes her escape). In the passage on Europa at 5.605ff. the main stress is on the (pictorial and playful) ABDUCTION by the god in the form of a bull at 607–14, which ensures a novel focus in accounts of this rape. In connection with Lucretia two functions are highlighted. ATTRACTION occupies 2.761–79, is twofold in nature (Sextus is attracted at the time that he sees Lucretia spinning and in retrospect) and is expressed by means of strong language and with emphatic repetition of words—all of which produces real foreboding and a distinct sense of inevitability. When Lucretia subsequently summons her husband and father to tell them of the rape, DETECTION extends over 2.815–28. This suits the long time that the very reluctant Lucretia takes to tell the story, but it also ensures great emotional impact, as Ovid dwells on the state to which she has been reduced by the rape (tears, misery, shame etc.) and also shows us her father and husband afraid, weeping and trying to console her. Something similar is in evidence with regard to stages. Flora, who covers Prelude and Contact in a single couplet (as noted above), devotes most of her account to the Aftermath stage (5.205–14) and there dilates on her RECOMPENSE for the rape (Zephyrus married her, made her goddess of flowers and gave her a fragrant paradise of a garden), thereby behaving naturally enough for an enthusiastic lover of flowers, and also building up her own status (see pp. 50f.). In connection with Callisto too the first two stages are passed over in two lines (2.161 and 162) and the bulk of the version is devoted to Aftermath (2.163ff.), but this time Ovid brings about a bleak mood by concentrating on aspects such as the DETECTION of the rape, DISCOMFITURE (as Callisto is rejected by her mistress Diana) and REVENGE (as Juno persecutes her). The most extreme example of such expansion occurs at 4.455ff., where stage three takes up 164 of the 200 lines and Ceres' SEARCH for the abducted Proserpine becomes the main thrust of the passage and is handled at such length as to amount virtually to a self-contained quest narrative within the rape account.

---

[27] Cf. Homer *Il.* 5.30 etc. On the Ovidian brevity here cf. MERLI 2000 38f.

Such an investigation of functions also clarifies norms and abnormalities. Although Ovid is at pains not to be predictable and monotonous when telling the same type of story again and again, some standard practices and sequences are in evidence. In the *Fasti* all these narratives have three stages and at least five functions. All are single rapes, apart from the Juturna/Lara narrative,[28] and most (8 out of 12) RAPES are successful. In stage one ATTRACTION is very common (in 10 out of 12 cases) and, as one might expect, PREPARATIONS always lead to a successful RAPE. Inevitably in stage two OVERTURES by the Rapist are rejected and FLIGHT by the Victim takes place before the actual RAPE and results in pursuit.

More interesting are the abnormalities in this connection. So, for example, there is variety and liveliness at 2.583ff., where there are two interlocking rape narratives (Juturna and Lara) in one passage.

---

[28] And all are heterosexual, although there is play on homosexual rape (of Hercules) in the lines on Omphale.

The double rape appears here only in the *Fasti* and is generally rare in Ovid,[29] while the playful tone of the first rape greatly increases the grimness of the second one (see the next section). With regard to Rhea Silvia there is a memorable and jocular form of DETECTION, as the rape in progress is actually concealed from the Victim (who is asleep and is not allowed to wake up) in a most unusual manner.[30] The story of Proserpine is marked off as something extraordinary not only by means of its great length but also because of the omission of ATTRACTION, the failure to state openly or imply clearly RAPE, the great stress on SEARCH and the Aftermath stage, the unique tripling of help during the SEARCH (at 4.509ff., 575ff., 583f.) and the unique twist whereby the Searcher herself gives help at 539ff. Ovid also rings the changes via some complex and clever play with functions at 2.337ff., where Faunus in the dark creeps into the cave where Omphale and Hercules are sleeping, shies away from her (because she is wearing Hercules' lion skin) and makes his attempt instead on the hero (who is dressed in her clothes): there the PHYSICAL APPROACH is unusually doubled, and remarkably the (foiled) RAPE involves the Rapist trying to rape not the Victim but her Helper, while VULNERABILITY and RESISTANCE figure in connection with the Helper.[31]

Looseness of plotting (as a result of expansion of functions and discursiveness with material other than functions) is not common, the major exception being the (very long) Proserpine passage. Most often Ovid is focused on the rapes, and quite tight plotting (with events tied closely to the rape and advancing directly to the end with onward drive) is especially evident in the case of 5.191ff. (Flora) and 603ff. (Europa). The plots are generally simple, in line with the brevity of most of the accounts, but some intricacy is present in several instances. There is elegant and effective patterning. Functions usually occur only once, but there is some repetition for stress. In addition to the doubling of PHYSICAL APPROACH (re Omphale) and ATTRACTION (re Lucretia) mentioned above, VULNERABILITY is mentioned twice in connection with the sleeping Lotis (at 1.423f. and 430, to heighten anticipation of sexual activity) and Proserpine (at 4.424 and 443f., to increase foreboding), and REVENGE is repeated in the story of Callisto (at 2.177ff. and 191f., to darken the mood still further and bring out the persecuting Juno's relentlessness). So too the stages have a steadily decreasing number of lines each and form a tricolon diminuendo at 1.393ff. and 2.305ff., making for short and sharp endings. Rather more complex is the Juturna/Lara narrative, where the REVENGE function of the Juturna rape at 2.607ff. leads smoothly into the second rape, as Lara the Helper of Juturna (who warned Juturna of Jupiter's plan to assault her) becomes the Victim of Mercury (as he takes her down to the Underworld in punishment). In both rapes a god is the Rapist and a nymph is the Victim; in both cases there is ATTRACTION and also APPEAL (firstly successful by the Rapist for help, and secondly unsuccessful by the Victim for mercy). In addition, in the second rape the formerly chattering Lara becomes sadly silent, the focus narrows from various nymphs to the isolated Lara and, whereas Juturna had escaped Jupiter's advances among woods, Lara is assaulted in a grove. Still more complex is 2.721ff. (Lucretia). There is fall and inversion there: initially (724ff.) Sextus and Collatinus make merry, but at the end one is banished and the other is miserable; while Lucretia goes from being pure and alive to being violated and dead. Also the account is clearly divided into three distinct episodes (occurring on subsequent days) with a progression in mood (from happy to sad and then to sadder still) and with pointed correspondence and contrast: (1) at 721–68 Sextus, Collatinus and other Romans come from the camp at Ardea to Lucretia's home, where she behaves modestly, speaks (of Collatinus using his sword) and is embraced by Collatinus, while Sextus is enamoured of her; (2) at 769–812 Sextus alone comes from the camp to Lucretia's home, crazed with passion, and there a mute Lucretia is embraced and raped by Sextus, who uses his sword to threaten her; (3) at 813ff. Lucretia's husband and father come from the camp to her home, where she speaks, uses a sword to kill herself, sinks down modestly and is embraced by Collatinus and her father.

---

[29] Compare elsewhere only Thetis and Chione at *Met.* 11.229ff., 301ff., where there are duplicate assaults on the same Victim each time.

[30] Cf. Tyro (Homer *Od.* 11.235ff.) and Chione (*Met.* 11. 307ff.), who are put to sleep by gods before they are raped.

[31] Ovid also indulges in sport with the Helper at 1.433f. and 6.342 (where the Helper is an ass each time), at 2.603ff. (where Lara acts as a Helper and foils the rape of Juturna, but then herself becomes a Victim and has no Helper of her own), and at 2.733ff., where Lucretia's husband (who later acts as Helper to her: 821ff.) is actually responsible for her rape by suggesting the night visit to check on the wives.

Polytonality

Some of the diversity evident in Ovid's handling of rapes in the *Fasti* has been illustrated by the last section. There is also diversity of tone, in the group as a whole and within individual accounts, to ensure unpredictability and a lively variety. This section will study a range of techniques employed by Ovid to amuse, move, shock, horrify etc. It will analyse mood in two largely neglected passages (on Cranae and on Juturna and Lara), and in particular it will elucidate a complex tonal mix hitherto unnoted by critics (in the Juturna/Lara and Proserpine narratives).

Seven of the rapes[32] are meant to be humorous, and the humour varies from broad farce to subtle wit. Typical is the passage on Cranae at 6.105ff. There is a teasingly solemn start to what is in fact a light-hearted tale (105f., on the ancient grove of Helernus with its cultic associations, where Cranae was born). After telling us that the nymph was forever hunting, Ovid informs us at 111f. that people thought that she was Diana (obviously because she was a beautiful huntress and goddess of the wild; but there is also less obvious play on the fact that she was a professional virgin who rejected all suitors). This huntress eluded her own hunters and mischievously tricked those who propositioned her (113ff.) by pretending to acquiesce readily but asking them to lead the way to a more secluded spot and then hiding behind their back (and they all fell for this rather patent ploy and presumably kept quiet about it through embarrassment!). But these suitors who do not perceive the obvious are soon succeeded by the nymph herself not perceiving the obvious. At 119 Janus sees her and desires what he sees, and there is a pawky touch in the repetition of the verb of seeing (*video*) here and two verbs for seeing in 123f., slyly alluding to the god's (very important) two sets of eyes.[33] When he speaks words of love to her, comically she tries the same ruse on him. Didn't she know about this rather famous god and his two faces? Couldn't she see that he had two? Or did he trick the trickster by only showing one face as he spoke to her? But didn't she see the other when he turned around to lead the way to a more secluded spot? Whatever the explanation is, this rather artful nymph is now being quite artless by trying to hide in plain sight, and Ovid heightens the humour by pretending to be so amazed at her silliness that he has to address her (as *stulta* 'stupid') and warn her that Janus has eyes in the back of his head (123ff.). But (of course!) it does no good and she is caught and raped by Janus in her hiding place (beneath a cliff, aptly enough for one described as *duram* 'hard' at 120).

---

[32] Lotis, Omphale, Rhea Silvia (see the section on rape and subversion), Flora (see pp. 49ff.), Europa, Cranae and Vesta (see the section on rape as challenge). Compare FANTHAM 1983 and RICHLIN 169ff. on such sexual comedy.

[33] For more on the doubling here see p. 22.

By way of a complete contrast two other rapes are very sad. Again there is variety, in the techniques employed to achieve pathos. The story of Callisto at 2.155ff. has impact largely because of a tragic series of events. This companion of Diana made a fatal oath to remain a virgin, and she fully intended to keep that oath, but was raped by Jupiter. On top of the shame that she felt at losing her virginity, when her pregnant state was discovered she was banished from her band by Diana as impure and a perjurer. In addition to that, when Callisto gave birth to a son, although she had been impregnated against her will, a furious Juno persecuted her, changing her from a beautiful nymph into an ugly and filthy bear. Years later she met her son and groaned, distraught, at the sight of him, as if she recognized him. In his ignorance he would have killed her with his javelin, had they not been both raised to heaven as stars. Even then Juno was not finished but persecuted Callisto further by not allowing her to set as a star.[34] In the case of Lucretia (2.711ff.) events are again important (especially Sextus' violation of hospitality and brutal rape of Lucretia, and her misery, humiliation and suicide). But in this much longer narrative characterization (of the two protagonists) is greatly developed and greatly increases the impact of the events, making for verisimilitude, involving readers and building up a powerful emotional charge (as we are led to hate and despise Sextus and to admire and pity Lucretia). So we are presented with two strongly antipathetic figures—a real villain (who is obsessive, immoral, callous, exploitative, pitiless etc.) and a real heroine (who is modest, chaste, courageous, a devoted and loving wife etc.).[35] Grim irony also makes its contribution here: for example, the adulterous rape is set in train as a result of a contest among the Romans about the loyalty of their wives; Lucretia's own husband, because he loves his wife and champions her cause, suggests a late night visit to check on the women and so is responsible for Sextus becoming inflamed by her; and Sextus is aroused to make an attempt on her chastity by her very chastity (2.765f.) *inter alia.*

---

[34] For comparison with the version of her rape in *Met.* 2.401ff. see pp. 247ff., HEINZE 349f., 385ff., FRÉCAUT 295f. and JOHNSON.

[35] For more on the characterization of Lucretia see pp. 197ff. and LEE 110ff., and for fuller discussion of Sextus see pp. 163ff. The Lucretia rape stands out especially because of its length and affectivity. Ovid may have dwelled on it because he found it moving and significant. He certainly devoted many lines to it to ensure that it has a powerful effect on readers. Variety within the group of rape narratives will also have been an aim. And Ovid was clearly trying to tell the story better than Livy had done (see pp. 191ff.).

Two of the rape narratives are tragicomic. The Juturna/Lara narrative at 2.585ff. contains an arresting and highly functional combination of levity and sympathy:

> Iuppiter, inmodico Iuturnae victus amore, 585
> multa tulit tanto non patienda deo:
> illa modo in silvis inter coryleta latebat,
> nunc in cognatas desiliebat aquas.
> convocat hic nymphas, Latium quaecumque tenebant,
> et iacit in medio talia verba choro: 590
> 'invidet ipsa sibi vitatque quod expedit illi
> vestra soror, summo iungere membra deo.
> consulite ambobus: nam quae mea magna voluptas,
> utilitas vestrae magna sororis erit.
> vos illi in prima fugienti obsistite ripa, 595
> ne sua fluminea corpora mergat aqua.'
> dixerat; adnuerant nymphae Tiberinides omnes
> quaeque colunt thalamos, Ilia diva, tuos.
> forte fuit Nais, Lara nomine; prima sed illi
> dicta bis antiquum syllaba nomen erat, 600
> ex vitio positum. saepe illi dixerat Almo
> 'nata, tene linguam': nec tamen illa tenet.
> quae simul ac tetigit Iuturnae stagna sororis,
> 'effuge' ait 'ripas', dicta refertque Iovis.
> illa etiam Iunonem adiit, miserataque nuptas 605
> 'Naida Iuturnam vir tuus' inquit 'amat.'
> Iuppiter intumuit, quaque est non usa modeste
> eripit huic linguam, Mercuriumque vocat:
> 'duc hanc ad manes: locus ille silentibus aptus.
> nympha, sed infernae nympha paludis erit.' 610
> iussa Iovis fiunt. accepit lucus euntes:
> dicitur illa duci tum placuisse deo.
> vim parat hic, voltu pro verbis illa precatur,
> et frustra muto nititur ore loqui,
> fitque gravis geminosque parit, qui compita servant 615
> et vigilant nostra semper in urbe Lares.

Jupiter, overcome by an inordinate passion for Juturna, endured much that so great a god should not have to bear. Sometimes she hid in

> the woods among hazel-thickets, on other occasions she plunged into her sisters' waters. He called together all the nymphs who lived in Latium and in their midst he said forcefully: 'Your sister is her own enemy and shuns something that is advantageous to her—intercourse with the greatest of the gods. Think of us both: for what will be very pleasurable for me will be very profitable for your sister. When she flees, block her on the edge of the riverbank, so that she cannot dive into the water.' So he spoke. All the Tiber's nymphs assented, and so did those who inhabit your halls, divine Ilia. There happened to be a Naiad called Lara. Her original name was the first syllable [of Lara] repeated, and it was assigned to match a fault of hers. Almo had often said to her, 'Hold your tongue, daughter,' but she did not hold it. As soon as she reached her sister Juturna's pool, she said, 'Keep away from riverbanks,' and repeated Jupiter's words. She even approached Juno and, feeling sorry for wives, said, 'Your husband loves the Naiad Juturna.' Enraged, Jupiter ripped out the tongue which she had used intemperately and summoned Mercury: 'Take her to the Underworld. That is the right place for mutes. She'll be a nymph, but a nymph of the nether marsh.' Jupiter's orders were carried out. As they went on their way they entered a grove. It was then, they say, that her divine guide became aroused by her. He got ready to rape her. She pleaded with a look in lieu of words, and her silenced mouth struggled in vain to speak. She became pregnant and gave birth to twins, who guard the crossroads and are always on watch in our city—the Lares.

The initial part of the narrative contains extensive humour. The very first couplet wittily inverts Jupiter's title *invictus* ('invincible')[36] as Ovid deflates the dignity of this great deity (*tanto . . . deo*, 586) from the start. At 587f. Juturna, that grave figure from Virgil's *Aeneid*, goes into hiding from a randy pursuer, lurking in thickets and water[37] (and there may well be a pun on *Latium* (589) in *latebat* 'she hid' at 587),[38] while the frustrated Jupiter for all his knowledge and power somehow cannot find her or catch her. As a result the supreme god (592) is reduced to begging for help and embarrassing himself publicly. In his speech to the nymphs he makes the arch and illogical[39] claim that sex with him would be an advantage, in fact a great advantage, for Juturna and appeals (twice) to their concern for their sister. And the nymphs actually agree to betray their own sister, apparently taken in by his patently self-serving rhetoric. Then, when Lara intervenes, she warns Juturna with the amusingly curt and enigmatic (almost oracular) *effuge ripas* ('keep away from riverbanks') and spills the beans to Juno with a decided flourish in 606 (with balance, pointed juxtaposition of *Iuturnam* and *vir* 'husband', and postponement of *amat* 'loves' for maximum effect).[40]

---

[36] Cf. e.g. 5.126, 6.650.

[37] See the section on rape and *doctrina* below for more sport with Virgil here.

[38] Compare 1.238, Virgil *Aen.* 8.322f.

[39] Especially with Juno in the background (605).

At this point (607ff.) there is an abrupt switch to pathos, which has all the more impact because it is so unexpected and contrasts starkly with the preceding hilarity. There is also impact in the unexpected direction[41] taken by the story now: in the midst of REVENGE in the first rape narrative a second rape narrative starts up (and this time the Victim *is* raped); and in place of the sex romp with Juturna suggested at 597f., and then further entertaining problems for her admirer suggested at 603ff., we are presented with a rapidly successive series of horrific events connected with the isolated and helpless Lara, conveyed in short clauses and sentences and packed into 10 lines (in contrast to the rather leisurely 22 lines that preceded). After 605f. one anticipates anger on Juno's part, but she promptly drops out of the tale and it is Jupiter who becomes angry, and the depth of his rage is startling, as he removes the offending tongue (note the brutal and painful *eripit* 'ripped out'), and then on top of that consigns Lara to the Underworld with its dismal marsh (contrast the Almo). Next, in the midst of a (gloomy) grove, Mercury becomes attracted to her, but this (and her pathetic state) does not make him pity or help her at all; instead he callously takes advantage of this vulnerable and recently crippled nymph. The sympathy reaches its height in 613f., where she knows what is coming, and is powerless to stop it, and struggles to speak, but can only appeal to him with a look (a particularly moving and telling detail), totally in vain. The final distich, on her pregnancy and the birth of the Lares, intimates a grimly brisk and businesslike rape and brings no real lightening of tone.

The tale of Proserpine at 4. 419ff. is also a tragicomedy, but here the lighter and darker elements coexist and are interwoven throughout rather than occupying separate parts of the narrative. Of course, the story is predominantly a sad one, and critics from HEINZE

---

[40] There may also be in retrospect (after 608) some black humour in 602, with play on Lara retaining her tongue as well as holding it.

[41] 2.584 suggests that this tale was little known by Ovid's time and had no literary precedent, and we possess no earlier versions of Jupiter's attempts on Juturna and Mercury's rape of Lara (and the conjunction of the two incidents).

(309ff.) to HINDS (1987b 103ff.) have noted and analysed the primary mood of plaintiveness here. But almost all of them have missed the humorous undercurrents and the various entertaining touches,[42] which are numerous enough to ensure that the passage is not too gloomy but subtle enough to raise just a smile rather than jarring laughter. Humour is a subjective matter, but there are so many probable instances of it at 4.419ff. that I hope that, even if readers quibble over some individual points, they will find enough of them acceptable to be persuaded of my overall thesis.

The story has a happy ending, and, mindful of that, Ovid includes light-hearted components from early on. In his opening lines there is ironical and witty foreshadowing of the abduction of Proserpine while picking flowers. At 431f. as soon as she sees the many flowers in a valley she urges her companions to carry them off (*referte*) with her, but she gets to carry off none of them, since Dis carries her off (*aufert*) as soon as he sees her at 445. His removal to the Underworld of his amatory prey (much to her companions' distress) is also anticipated by the designation of the picked flowers as *praeda* ('prey') that delights them in 433, by the description of the plants as holding and delaying them and being loved by them in 439f., and by the associations of many of the flowers preyed upon at 435ff. (flowers in general and roses in particular (here collected in abundance) were connected with Venus; violets decked graves; poppies were supposed to cause death; the hyacinths conjure up the young boy loved and killed by Apollo; and Proserpine herself picks crocuses, which were planted at tombs, and lilies, which were a symbol of transience and had links with death).[43] In addition, when Proserpine ill-advisedly wanders (*errabat*, 426) through meadows in the area where she will be abducted, there may well be play on the sense of 'made a mistake' in the Latin verb.[44]

When Ceres turns up to look for her missing daughter, it is perhaps a little odd to compare this deity to devotees of a deity (Bacchantes) in 457f., and Ovid then progresses in the very next couplet to liken her to a (mooing!) cow, and as if that was not an incongruous enough mixture, at 482 this versatile Bacchante/cow becomes a nightingale as well. At 463ff. there is the whimsical picture of Ceres as a tracker and the facetious suggestion that she could recognize her daughter's tracks from her body weight; and then Ovid sports with the idea of her famous lengthy search not taking place at all, until the tracks are ruined, by something as mundane as pigs. When she actually goes off on her quest for her daughter, there could well be an element of humour in the long list of places visited by her at 467ff., as she ranges widely over the earth while Persephone is beneath her feet all the time (something we are reminded of in 491f., by the allusion to Typhos imprisoned in Hades). So too when we get more lists of places later at 499ff. and 563ff., where she scours the earth again and also the sea and finally mounts to heaven, one is tempted to shout, 'Cold, cold, colder,' as she gets further and further away from Proserpine.

---

[42] Cf. however FANTHAM 1998 180 and 186 for a few suggestions of humour.

[43] See MURGATROYD 1992 93, *OLD* s.v. *viola* 1b, Juvenal 7.208 (and Mayor ad loc.), *A.P.* 7.485, Virg. *Aen.* 6.883, Ovid *Met.* 10.162ff.

[44] There may be similar puns with *erro* and *pererro* on Ceres being off the track in 498, 568, 573 and 575.

Her pause in Attica at 503ff. also has its quirky side. Old Celeus' daughter at 513f. asks her what she is doing there, when she is in fact looking for her daughter. When Celeus begs Ceres to enter his humble home, she refuses, explains that she has lost her girl and exclaims sadly (in 520) *heu, melior quanto sors tua sorte mea est* 'ah, how much better is your lot than my lot'. That line is almost identical with *Amores* 1.6.46 (spoken with wry self-mockery to a doorkeeper by the flippant Ovid, who vainly begs the man to let him into his mistress' house). There are additional diverting twists, as Ceres of her own volition remains outside initially but finally does go in, when begged to enter (twice) by her male addressee. Later, at 549ff., after easily healing his sick son (though unable to help herself), Ceres tries to purge the boy's mortality in fire, but the solemn and marvellous ceremony is completely undercut by ludicrously misplaced good intentions—the horrified attempt to 'save' him by his mother (who is described with droll paradox as being ineptly devoted and criminal while not being criminal).

Ceres then goes off on her travels (once more!) and we are given (yet another!) long list of places visited by her. At 577ff. with unconscious irony Ceres questions a constellation that includes the raped Callisto about her daughter (who has in fact been raped) and tactlessly remarks that these stars must know because they never set (when that was actually a punishment, for Callisto's pregnancy due to rape, imposed by Juno). When she discovers what has happened and that the rapist (and by now husband) is Dis, she rounds on Jupiter at

587ff., with a tart reminder that he is Proserpine's father and so should care about her and a show of snobbery about the status of Proserpine's new husband. Jupiter has to try to smooth her ruffled feathers, defending the standing of Dis, their new son-in-law (who is at the same time their brother), to Dis' own sister. And the whole situation is only resolved by Jupiter with the partial restoration of Persephone when he has to give in to blackmail by Ceres (who has stopped the crops and threatens to leave heaven for the Underworld).

Rape as Challenge

Ovid demonstrated his versatility with other features of rapes too, constantly varying elements like pace, setting, length (ranging from Proserpine, the longest mythical narrative in the poem, to Europa, one of the shortest), participants (as well as the Rapist and the Victim, characters such as the helper, the avenger, the punisher and the searcher figure at different points) and ramifications (the naming of a continent, the eventual rise of Rome, sundry changes of status for the Victim due to things like marriage, motherhood and stellification, and so on).[45] Clearly the poet challenged himself to ring the changes with this group of narratives, and he set himself a particular challenge in connection with a particular narrative—the very first rape (Lotis), which he revisited in two subsequent accounts (Omphale and Vesta). The relationship between these passages has hardly been probed,[46] and the point to the reprise each time has not been perceived. This section will attempt to cast new light on these important aspects.

The first story (at 1.393ff.) needs to be quoted in full:

festa corymbiferi celebrabas, Graecia, Bacchi,
  tertia quae solito tempore bruma refert.
di quoque cultores in idem venere Lyaei 395
  et quicumque iocis non alienus erat,

---

[45] Variety is also achieved by means of twists in this connection. At 5.699ff. there is a variant on a rape narrative (ABDUCTION and SEARCH figure here, but there is no actual RAPE and this is rather a combat narrative). At other points there is surprising ellipse of rape: see pp. 227f., and note also that at 3.179ff. after a great build-up to the Rape of the Sabine Women, with everything leading to it and the actual festival at which it took place named, recountal of the event is high-handedly postponed by an internal narrator.

[46] Some similarities between the passages are listed in RICHLIN 171, FANTHAM 1983 203 and NEWLANDS 127f.

Panes et in Venerem Satyrorum prona iuventus
quaeque colunt amnes solaque rura deae.
venerat et senior pando Silenus asello,
quique ruber pavidas inguine terret aves.
dulcia qui dignum nemus in convivia nacti
gramine vestitis accubuere toris:
vina dabat Liber, tulerat sibi quisque coronam,
miscendas parce rivus agebat aquas.
Naides effusis aliae sine pectinis usu,
pars aderant positis arte manuque comis;
illa super suras tunicam collecta ministrat,
altera dissuto pectus aperta sinu;
exserit haec umerum, vestes trahit illa per herbas,
impediunt teneros vincula nulla pedes.
hinc aliae Satyris incendia mitia praebent,
pars tibi, qui pinu tempora nexa geris:
te quoque, inexstinctae Silene libidinis, urunt:
nequitia est quae te non sinit esse senem.
at ruber, hortorum decus et tutela, Priapus
omnibus ex illis Lotide captus erat:
hanc cupit, hanc optat, sola suspirat in illa,
signaque dat nutu sollicitatque notis.
fastus inest pulchris sequiturque superbia formam:
inrisum voltu despicit illa suo.
nox erat, et vino somnum faciente iacebant
corpora diversis victa sopore locis;
Lotis in herbosa sub acernis ultima ramis,
sicut erat lusu fessa, quievit humo.
surgit amans animamque tenens vestigia furtim
suspenso digitis fert taciturna gradu.
ut tetigit niveae secreta cubilia nymphae,
ipsa sui flatus ne sonet aura cavet;
et iam finitima corpus librabat in herba:
illa tamen multi plena soporis erat.
gaudet et a pedibus tracto velamine vota
ad sua felici coeperat ire via.
ecce rudens rauco Sileni vector asellus
intempestivos edidit ore sonos.
territa consurgit nymphe, manibusque Priapum
reicit, et fugiens concitat omne nemus.
at deus, obscena nimium quoque parte paratus,
omnibus ad lunae lumina risus erat.
morte dedit poenas auctor clamoris; et haec est
Hellespontiaco victima grata deo.

Greece, you were holding the festival of ivy-crowned Bacchus that is regularly celebrated every third winter. The divine followers of Lyaeus [Bacchus] also attended, and so did all those who were no strangers

> to fun, Pans and young Satyrs keen on sex and the goddesses who inhabit rivers and the lonely countryside. Old Silenus also came, on an ass with a sagging back, and so did the red terror [Priapus] who scares the birds with his phallus. They found a suitable grove for a pleasant party and lay down on couches of grass. Liber [Bacchus] supplied wine, they had all brought garlands for themselves, and a brook provided water to be mixed sparingly [with the wine]. Naiads were there, some with streaming, uncombed hair, others with skilfully coiffured hair. One serves with her tunic hitched up above her calves, another with her breasts revealed through her torn dress; this one bares a shoulder, that one trails her skirt along the grass; no [sandals with] straps impede their delicate feet. So some inflame the Satyrs with a gentle passion, and some inflame you [Pan] with your garland of pine on your brow; they also set you on fire, Silenus, you with your unquenchable lust, kept young by your lecherousness. But red Priapus, the glory and guardian of gardens, was captivated by Lotis out of them all. She is the one he desires, the one he wants, the only one that he sighs for; he gives her signs by nodding and winks seductively. But lovely females are haughty, and pride is the concomitant of beauty: she mocks him and gives him scornful looks. It was night, and the wine made people drowsy. Bodies lay here and there, overcome by sleep. Lotis, just as she was, tired by the revelling, was slumbering on the grassy ground under the branches of a maple, out beyond all the others. Her lover gets up and, holding his breath, sneaks up to her silently on tiptoe. When he reaches the secluded spot where the snow-white nymph is lying, he takes care that his breathing doesn't make a sound; and now his body was poised on the grass beside her, while she was filled with deep sleep. He's delighted, lifts the skirt up from her feet and starts on the happy road to his heart's desire. Suddenly the ass that was Silenus' mount gave a hoarse hee-haw and brayed at the wrong moment. The nymph jumped up in terror, pushed Priapus off with her hands and fled, waking up the whole grove. The god in the moonlight (his penis also all too ready for action) was laughed at by them all. The ass that made the loud noise was punished with death and is a welcome sacrificial victim to the god of the Hellespont [Priapus].

That bit of bedroom farce provides a light-hearted start to the rapes in the *Fasti*. Expectations of sexual activity are carefully aroused at 393ff. (see pp. 226f.) and especially 405ff. (with a lively sketch), only to be frustrated; and at 425ff. there is the undignified picture of Priapus creeping towards Lotis and subsequently foiled and ridiculed, when the rape is spoiled by an ass (an animal which proverbially was salacious but also unco-operative).[47] The next rape after Lotis is the very different story of Callisto at 2.155ff., but then at 2.305ff. come the rather similar lines on Omphale. According to Ovid Faunus caught sight of her in the country with Hercules and fell in love with her; after changing into each other's clothes, she and the hero dined and retired to bed in a cave (separate beds for ritual chastity because they would attend a festival the next day); finding everybody asleep, Faunus crept into the cave in the darkness, went up to Omphale's bed, but shrank away from that when he felt Hercules' lion-skin there; he went to the next bed, felt Omphale's soft clothing there, became very aroused and tried to rape Hercules, until the hero woke up and pushed the god off the bed; lights were brought and all laughed at Faunus groaning in pain on the ground.

---

[47] Cf. e.g. Plaut. *Pseud.* 136f., Ovid *Am.* 2.7.15f., Juvenal 6.334, 9.92.

Apart from numerous minor details in common,[48] once again Ovid presents a frivolous account of a rustic god (with an erection) in the country making a furtive approach at night to a sleeping Victim amid slumbering forms, reaching her and starting to remove her clothing, but at the crucial moment being pushed off, and then being publicly exposed and laughed at by the company. A good joke bears repeating, but here Ovid is trying to go one better, to actually outdo himself, with added humour and complexity. At the same time as demonstrating his ingenuity, he thereby gives the narrative extra point and provides extra entertainment and mental exercise for the reader. On top of the play with functions and the Helper noted earlier in this chapter, the humorous addition of the cross-dressing cleverly facilitates the foiling of the rape, and this time Ovid sets up and then frustrates expectations of sex not just once but twice (sex with Hercules when he and Omphale retire to the cave after taking off their clothes to exchange them and after drinking, and then later sex with Faunus). This time the Rapist goes for someone completely different to his intended Victim, trying to strip and rape Hercules himself. Priapus at least had the right Victim; Faunus can't even manage that, and when he does go to the correct bed he backs off in a panic (here the Rapist is terrified rather than the Victim Lotis, and this time the Victim laughs at the Rapist rather than fleeing in terror). Priapus was foiled due to an outside agent, whereas Faunus is foiled due to his own blundering. And Faunus' humiliation is greater—a god afraid of a mortal and physically inferior to him, groaning and disabled just by being pushed out of bed, and ridiculed by humans rather than gods.

---

[48] E.g. the use of the story to explain a cultic practice, description of female attire, and allusion to a festival of Bacchus, nymphs, a nearby stream and the drinking of wine.

Ovid really sails close to the wind with Vesta (6.321ff.):

> turrigera frontem Cybele redimita corona
>   convocat aeternos ad sua festa deos;
> convocat et satyros et, rustica numina, nymphas;
>   Silenus, quamvis nemo vocarat, adest.
> nec licet et longum est epulas narrare deorum: 325
>   in multo nox est pervigilata mero.
> hi temere errabant in opacae vallibus Idae,
>   pars iacet et molli gramine membra levat;
> hi ludunt, hos somnus habet; pars bracchia nectit
>   et viridem celeri ter pede pulsat humum. 330
> Vesta iacet placidamque capit secura quietem,
>   sicut erat, positum caespite fulta caput.
> at ruber hortorum custos nymphasque deasque
>   captat, et errantes fertque refertque pedes;
> aspicit et Vestam: dubium nymphamne putarit 335
>   an scierit Vestam, scisse sed ipse negat.
> spem capit obscenam, furtimque accedere temptat,
>   et fert suspensos corde micante gradus.
> forte senex, quo vectus erat, Silenus asellum
>   liquerat ad ripas lene sonantis aquae; 340
> ibat ut inciperet longi deus Hellesponti,
>   intempestivo cum rudit ille sono.
> territa voce gravi surgit dea; convolat omnis
>   turba, per infestas effugit ille manus.

> Cybele, whose brow is encircled by a turreted crown, invited the eternal gods to her feast. She aso invited the Satyrs and the nymphs, divinities of the countryside. Although nobody had given him an invitation, Silenus was there. To describe the gods' banquet is not permitted and would take a long time: they stayed awake all night, drinking lots of wine. Some roamed at random in shadowy Ida's valleys, others lay down, resting their bodies on the soft grass; some played, some slept, others linked arms and struck the green ground in triple time with darting feet. Vesta lay down, just as she was, and had a peaceful sleep without a care, her head placed on the turf for a pillow. But the red guardian of gardens tried to catch nymphs and goddesses, turning his roaming steps this way and that. He also caught sight of Vesta. It is unclear whether he thought she was a nymph or knew she was Vesta, but he himself denies that he knew. Hoping for sex, he tried to sneak up on tiptoe, his heart going pit-a-pat. By chance old Silenus had left on the banks of a gently babbling stream the ass on which he had been mounted. The god of the long Hellespont was on his way to

> getting started, when it went hee-haw, braying at the wrong moment. Terrified by its deep voice, up jumped the goddess; the whole crowd came flying up together; Priapus escaped through hands that threatened violence.

The similarities to the lines on Lotis are obvious and numerous, but the explanation of the extensive correspondence is problematical and controversial. Generally scholars have written off the Vesta narrative (e.g. as a weakly derivative doublet of the Lotis story, or as an inferior earlier version of the same basic tale, or as a closural device that undermines the authority of the didactic poet Ovid)[49] and have felt that of the two passages it was the one most likely to have been omitted in a final revised version of the poem. They may be right. But a closer look suggests that in fact 6.321ff. work rather well where they are and that Ovid is up to the same tricks as he was with the passage on Omphale and has the same general aims, but is this time taking a much greater risk.

For a start there appears to me to be a decided element of impudent audacity here. Ovid seems to be taunting and mocking his readers, and one can hardly believe that he has the effrontery to produce one after another of these outrageously close coincidences. In addition, the order in the poem of these two anecdotes conjures up a risible picture of Priapus not having learnt his lesson, trying the same kind of furtive approach to a sleeping female yet again and being foiled in the same way yet again (why didn't the idiot check for the ass and remove it, one wonders).

However, at the same time there are distinct differences, and Ovid seems to be challenging us to spot and savour those differences, to get added stimulation and enjoyment by thoughtfully measuring these verses on Vesta against those on Lotis. The introductory couplet at 6.319f. highlights the two major areas of divergence—brevity and added humour. Whereas the passage on Lotis (an *aetion* for the sacrifice of asses to Priapus) was introduced with *causa pudenda quidem, sed tamen apta deo* 'the reason is certainly disgraceful, but fitting for the god' (1.392), at 6.319f. after mentioning Priapus' disgrace Ovid adds the words *est multi fabula parva ioci* 'it is a short story with a lot of laughs'.

---

[49] For further discussion and bibliography see FRAZER II 171, IV 231, LE BONNIEC 1965 75, FANTHAM 1983 203ff., WILLIAMS 197 (who speaks in defence of the Vesta account, but not all that convincingly) and NEWLANDS 127ff.

In line with this at 6.321ff. Ovid produces an adroitly condensed version of the Lotis rape. He reduces a passage of 48 verses to 24 verses, following all the elements of the earlier story but consistently abbreviating them (for example, 3 couplets on the gods attending are scaled down to 1, and 7 couplets on the festivities become 3). He also omits several of the functions found at 1.393ff. (ARRIVAL, OVERTURES, RESISTANCE and DISCOMFITURE) and abridges others. This streamlining produces a swifter and snappier narrative.[50]

The most striking aspect of the humour at 6.321ff. is that there the tone is more irreverent, the situation is more scandalous, and Priapus is even more of a reprobate. He goes after not a nymph but Vesta herself, an august major goddess synonymous with virginity (as Ovid has just reminded us at 6.283ff.), and Vesta of all people is very nearly raped, and by a crude rustic with an enormous penis at that. Hence the embarrassed (and quite possibly lying) claim at 335f. that he did not know it was Vesta, as Priapus is amusingly dragged into the narrative, and hence the outrage of the company at 343f. (where Priapus has to flee to avoid being beaten up rather than just being laughed at). On top of that, whereas in book 1 Priapus had been attracted to Lotis alone and made approaches to her before attempting to rape her, in book 6 the god only turns to Vesta after trying it on with various goddesses and nymphs, and he makes no initial overtures to Vesta but has immediate recourse to rape. Furthermore, in the Lotis passage it was Priapus alone who lost his dignity, but here Vesta also loses hers. After 325ff., the picture of her falling asleep in 331f. suggests that this normally staid goddess has partied to the point of exhaustion (and quite possibly drunk too much as well), especially if she can sleep among all the noise and activity around her. It is also ludicrously naive of Vesta to enjoy such peaceful and carefree slumber (331) when surrounded by Priapus and other drunken lechers. And in 343 the goddess is terrified by the bray of an ass; and that when she had more reason to be terrified by Priapus, and the ass is in fact her saviour.

---

[50] This has led to criticism that 6.321ff. is jejune and lacking in colourful details, and that 1.393ff. is more coherent and consistent. This is largely a matter of personal taste. I myself see no incoherence or inconsistency in the later passage. Given that Ovid was repeating the main outline of events, he may well have felt that lots of minor points could be taken as read this time and need not be spelled out all over again, and that repetition of many lesser details would have been tedious and excessive. Certainly the colourful lines on the nymphs at 1.405ff. would be far less relevant in the case of the assault on Vesta.

Other touches appear aimed at still more humour. At 6.319f., in view of the immediately succeeding reference to Priapus' disgrace, it seems likely that *rubicunde* 'red' contains a pun and alludes not only to the red paint of Priapus' statue but also to his blushes. In 324 Silenus this time is not invited but crashes the party, and tantalizingly there is no mention of his ass at this point (leaving us wondering about it until 339). Line 325 (about it not being permitted and taking a long time to describe this banquet of the gods) is a cheeky little in-joke about his streamlining, as Ovid has already described such festivities at length at 1.401ff. This time (in 327) the poet gives a specific location for the party, and there is wit here, since Ida had all too apt amatory associations (the rape of Ganymede and the Judgment of Paris took place there, and it was the home of Paris' girlfriend Oenone).[51] At 335f. the rather improbable suggestion that Priapus may have mistaken Vesta for a nymph is a knowing reference back to his assault on Lotis. Finally, in 341 there may well be a double entendre in *ibat* 'was on his way' (the verb was used of copulating and ejaculating), while *longi* 'long' in such a context surely conjures up the god's large penis.[52]

Rape and Doctrina

Another type of cleverness, *doctrina* (scholarship, learning), permeates the rapes, making for a piquant combination, as well as constantly intriguing and adding interest, point and an exotic flavour. The *doctrina* takes a wide range of forms. Most of the rapes have an aetiological slant, and the Europa rape at 5.605ff. is employed to privilege one *aetion* over another, giving greater weight to the explanation of the Taurus constellation as deriving from Jupiter's manifestation as a bull during his abduction of the heroine (the alternative derivation, from Io in her bovine state, receives only a single couplet, tacked on at the end). Geographical *doctrina* is also present, most notably in the lists of places passed by Ceres in her search for her daughter (4.467ff., 499ff., 563ff.), and can be particularly pointed (e.g. Ida as a setting for the attempt on Vesta, as just noted). Ovid makes erudite and unconventional identifications too—Flora was Chloris, the *dea Muta* is Lara, Carna is Cranae.[53] He also indulges in provocative etymologizing: according to her Flora is a corruption of Chloris, and Lara was originally called Lala (obviously connected with the Greek *lalein* 'to prattle') because she was a chatterbox.[54] Novelty and rarity in connection with details and whole stories have a recherché appeal: Ovid alone links the cross-dressing at 2.317ff. with the Omphale rape (neatly facilitating Faunus' mistake over identity), and there are no extant versions of the tales of Lotis, Juturna, Lara, Omphale, Flora, Cranae and Vesta in any other earlier or contemporary authors.[55] There is often a stimulating sharpness in allusions as well: for example, Callisto's metamorphosis into a bear is foreshadowed at 2.173 by Diana's designation of her as *Lycaoni* 'daughter of Lycaon' (her father Lycaon changed into a wolf),[56] and at 1.423 the picture of Lotis asleep under a tree just before Priapus' attempt on her seems to glance at an alternative version of the tale in which she escaped him by being turned into a tree.[57]

---

[51] See e.g. 2.145, 6.15f., 44, *Her.* 5.73, 138, Virgil *Aen.* 5.252ff., Apollod. *Bibl.* 3.12.6.

[52] See ADAMS 144, 175, 190 and cf. BARCHIESI 1997 138.

Perhaps most significant in this connection are the literary (intertextual) aspects. Reminiscences of other writers occur throughout the rapes and continually affect their colour and impact. So, for instance, the lines on Rhea Silvia (3.11ff.) look to Ennius,[58] and the account of the rape of Proserpine at 4.419ff. is an ambitious and sustained piece of *contaminatio* that combines allusions to *Hom. Hymn* 2, Hellenistic authors, Cicero, Lucretius, Horace and Virgil.[59] Something rather different (and hitherto unremarked) happens in connection with Turnus' sister Juturna at 2.585ff. (quoted above in the section on polytonality). There we find an expansion of a detail in Virgil's *Aeneid* and a passage whose true flavour can only be properly appreciated in the light of its extensive and complex engagement with Virgil's epic, as Ovid presents an erotic and irreverent 'prequel' and a startling new picture of the imposing and tragic helper of Turnus found in Virgil.[60] At *Aeneid* 12.138ff. there is a brief and dignified reference to Juturna as mistress of pools and rivers, an honour given to her by Jupiter in return for taking her virginity. That bare reference is developed by Ovid into a full-blown narrative, with typical spins—Ovid is flippant instead of serious, depicts Jupiter as *failing* to deprive her of her virginity as he tells only part of the story (the earlier, unsuccessful part), and presents Juturna not as in charge of waters for losing her virginity but (588) leaping into them to preserve it. At *Aeneid* 12.222ff. she initially foils the duel between Turnus and Aeneas; in Ovid she foils her own rape. Whereas at *Aeneid* 12.448f. she flees from the onset of Aeneas (by now recovered from the arrow wound) with his Trojans, in the *Fasti* she flees (595) from a lustful divine admirer. At *Aeneid* 12.468ff. she takes the place of Turnus' charioteer and drives him over the battlefield, repeatedly evading the enraged Aeneas; in Ovid she repeatedly evades the randy Jupiter. The grim duel between the two heroes which does finally take place and which forms the sombre climax of the *Aeneid* is also called to mind by Ovid's frivolous verses. After his sword shatters in the fighting, at 12.733ff. Turnus flees from a pursuing male intent on killing him,[61] whereas Ovid's Juturna flees from a pursuing male intent on copulating with her. Next in the *Aeneid* (12.774ff.) the Rutulian gets vital aid from Faunus (who retains Aeneas' spear) and Juturna (who gives Turnus a sword), but that aid is quickly counteracted by Venus (who gives Aeneas his spear back); in the *Fasti* the nymphs agree to help Jupiter catch Juturna so he can have sex with her, but that help is quickly undermined by Lara spilling the beans. In Virgil (12.791ff.) Jupiter next appeals to Juno and tells her to stop interfering, and she agrees; in Ovid he appeals to the nymphs and asks them to interfere (in his amatory escapade), and they agree. At *Aeneid* 12.883ff. a cowed Juturna (who can help her brother no more) wishes that she could join Turnus in the Underworld and in her grief plunges into a deep river, while in Ovid an uncowed Juturna plunges into water to help herself escape Jupiter's advances, and it is Lara who goes to the Underworld. At *Aeneid* 12.887 the nymph abruptly drops out of the narrative, prior to the wounding and death of Turnus (whose soul flees to the shades below); in the same way she suddenly disappears from the story at *Fasti* 2.607, but this time prior to the mutilation of Lara and her trip to the Underworld.

---

[53] 5.195, 2.583ff., 6.101ff.

[54] 5.195f., 2.599ff.

[55] FANTHAM 1983 195f. and 202 speculates on Alexandrian sources for the passages on Omphale and Lotis.

[56] *Met.* 1.237.

[57] *Met.* 9.346ff.

[58] See CONNORS 107f.

[59] See HERTER, HINDS 1987b 38ff., 57ff. and FANTHAM 1998 173ff. Two extra Virgilian reminiscences can be added—4.451–3 and 495ff. (see pp. 106f.).

---

[60] Readers may not be convinced by some of my suggested links, but there are so many possible and probable correspondences and contrasts that overall play with Virgil seems certain to me.

[61] With water and a tree in the vicinity (12.745, 766ff.); cf. *Fasti* 2.587f.

Rape as Subversion

Obviously there is a subversive element in the passage just considered, and it is time now to consider the various forms of subversion which are evident in the rapes in the *Fasti* and which so frequently give these accounts an extra layer, of stimulation and provocation, of mischief and real bite.

There is literary subversion in the Juturna rape, which sports with and undermines Virgil's renowned and revered epic poem. Ovid, being Ovid, was also quite prepared to undercut his own poetry. So in the particular case of the lines on Juturna the humour is suddenly sabotaged by the vicious rape of Lara; and on a broader front it is a subtly subversive touch to have in the generally graver elegiacs of the *Fasti*[62] so many rapes and in fact to use them as a linking thread. Religious subversion is common in this poem so concerned with religion. In the midst of serious and erudite discussion of deities, cults and ritual practices we find various gods as rapists, losing their dignity and becoming figures of fun, and several rather comical goddesses (such as Cranae the tease, who tries to hide behind Janus' back). In this connection there is also subversion of Rome and her origins. I have already discussed in the section on rape as challenge Ovid's levity at the expense of Vesta. That amounts to mockery of one of the *di consentes* (the 12 great Roman gods), a venerable divinity who had long-standing connections with Rome (as Ovid had remarked a little earlier at 6.249ff.) and on whose worship the city's permanence depended. Then there is Mars' rape of Rhea Silvia at 3.11ff. Beneath the surface solemnity (the prophetic dream etc.) there is debunking. The god's role is reduced to that of a self-indulgent predator, a smooth operator and apparently a very aroused lover who climaxed quickly. For in a single line with a slick verbal chain he sees, desires and has Rhea—*Mars videt hanc visamque cupit potiturque cupita* 'Mars saw her and desired the one he saw and possessed the one he desired'

---

[62] Cf. 2.3ff.

(3.21). In addition to the fact that (as we have just been reminded) Rhea Silvia was a Vestal Virgin on a sacred mission, Mars unsportingly took advantage of her while she was sleeping, used his divine power to keep her asleep during intercourse, and then promptly disappeared from the scene, leaving her to cope with the consequences. As for Rhea Silvia, on top of sleeping through the rape, this virgin also woke up completely unaware that she had been raped (by a vigorous and impetuous god). She was shaky after her experience (3.39) and had to rest against a tree (3.26), but had no idea why she was so faint and weary (3.25).

Since Augustus had links with Vesta and Mars, those last two passages bring me to my final form of subversion—deflation of the emperor. Of course, the whole issue of Ovid's attitude to Augustus in this poem is extremely complicated, and there is much controversy over the questions of how sincere the adulation of the *princeps* is, whether there actually is material unflattering to the emperor in the *Fasti* and what exact interpretation should be placed on such material.[63] This is too vast a topic to be handled in the detail that it merits in a single brief section. For what it is worth, my own reading is that Ovid amuses himself by turning things on their head and now taking over the role of eulogist, but toys with that role, unable in the *Fasti* (as in his earlier poetry)[64] to resist (necessarily) subtle digs at a grand figure such as Augustus, but making them in a spirit of light-hearted irreverence rather than strong antagonism or serious criticism (to entertain like-minded readers and cock a snook at the rest). I see one probable and four possible instances of such subversion in the rapes. I list them below with some comment as a minor contribution to this ongoing debate and leave readers to make up their own minds about them.

Unlike some Ovidian scholars (with axes to grind) who are fanciful, over-subtle and uncritical in their readiness to spot and accept undermining and anti-Augustan elements, I class four instances as only possible because nothing is spelled out and there is nothing to point up deflation of the emperor. Part of the problem here is that he was associated with so many divinities, rites and temples that almost any facetious or vaguely negative reference to them can be made out to be a jibe at him. So in representing Mars as such a rapist at 3.11ff. Ovid might be trying to diminish the god to whom Augustus dedicated the temple of Mars Ultor.[65] So too the fun at the expense of Vesta at 6.321ff. might be aimed specifically at the prominence that Augustus gave to that goddess.[66] It is also possible that Ovid's frivolity at 2.305ff. (Faunus the failed rapist) in the midst of his discussion of the Lupercalia amounts to gentle guying of the emperor's revival of that festival.[67] And I would suggest that it may not be mere coincidence that in the double rape narrative at 2.585ff. the pair of rapists are two gods with whom the *princeps* was identified (Jupiter and Mercury),[68] while the Lares (fathered on Lara by Mercury) could have called Augustus to mind as they were a pet project of his.[69] In this case and the next Ovid might be playing on stories of Augustus' lechery and adultery.[70]

---

[63] For a quick survey of the rival positions with bibliography see TOOHEY 135f., and for the most recent treatment of the topic see White and Fantham in BOYD 2002 20ff., 197ff.

[64] E.g. *Am.* 1.2.51f., 2.4.17f., *A.A.* 1.131f., 171ff.

The account of Callisto's rape is a more likely example of subversion.[71] Shortly before, at 2.119–144, Ovid celebrated the Nones of February when Augustus received the title of *pater patriae* ('father of the fatherland'). There Ovid likened the emperor to Jupiter in high heaven; he also *inter alia* contrasted the *princeps* with the rapist Romulus, highlighted his moral legislation in support of female chastity, and depicted him as an opponent of crime, a champion of law over violence and one who was merciful to his enemies (131f., 139–41, 143). The passage is immediately succeeded by a brief reference to Ganymede (145f.) and shortly after that by the much longer tale of Callisto (155ff.). Thereby Augustus is compared to Jupiter himself on high, but then we are promptly reminded (twice) that the god was an erotic predator, and heaven was also the place for the abducted pretty boy Ganymede and the raped and wretched Callisto (in star form). And Augustus' double is shown to possess characteristics that systematically contradict qualities just assigned to Augustus himself: at 155ff. Jupiter is a lawless and immoral rapist, preys on a female who wanted to remain chaste (157ff.), forces himself on her (178) and is quite merciless towards her. Nothing is explicit (and one would not expect it to be), but there seems to me to be obvious undercutting achieved via placement and ironic contrasts, especially in the case of the grim and tragic tale of Callisto that follows close on the seemingly solemn adulation and actually exceeds it in length (38 lines, as opposed to 26).

---

[65] See 5.545ff., GALINSKY 198ff. For suggestions of further subversion by means of Mars compare BOYLE-WOODARD xliii and BARCHIESI 1997 62ff., although I am not sure that I agree with the former or understand the latter.

[66] See FANTHAM 1983 207f., NEWLANDS 130f., BARCHIESI 1997 137ff.

[67] Suet. *Aug.* 31.4. Cf. NEWLANDS 59f., although nudity of the Luperci seems less to the point.

[68] Cf. e.g. 2.131f., Hor. *C.* 1.2.41ff., 3.5.1ff. (with the commentators).

[69] Cf. e.g. 5.143ff., Suet. *Aug.* 31.4., GALINSKY 300ff. The claim in FEENEY 12 and NEWLANDS 160f. that the mutilation of Lara is a reminder of the power of authority to restrict speech seems to me to involve too much of a jump.

[70] As in Suet. *Aug.* 69, 71.

[71] HARRIES 166f. first suggested this, and I have gratefully incorporated several of his points. Cf. also GEE 180ff.

Rapes and Love Poetry

A final facet of this multifaceted group deserves mention. Ovid also employs these tales as a way of introducing erotic subject matter into the *Fasti*, thereby adding variety and liveliness, and providing a link to his earlier poetry, while also injecting novelty into his amatory oeuvre and taking Latin elegiac *amor* ('love') off in something of a new direction.[72]

These rapes are in fact the main way of working love/lust into the poem. There are, of course, passing references to it elsewhere in the *Fasti*, but more extensive allusion is confined to the mythical and legendary narratives, and among those only two others have a major amatory interest (3.461ff. on Ariadne and her rival, and 3.677ff. on Anna's tricking of Mars in his pursuit of Minerva).[73]

The *amor* in these rape accounts[74] *per se* recalls previous Ovidian writings in general, as does the frequent levity in connection with it. In particular these passages bear obvious similarities to the mythical digressions in the *Ars Amatoria* and *Remedia*, while also evoking the mythological material (especially the females) of the *Heroides*. But there are also major differences, to ensure variation. For example, in these narratives the form is not the same as in the *Heroides*, nor is the viewpoint (except in the case of Flora), and the characters are quite different, and contact rather than separation is the focus. And, in contrast to the *A.A.*, *Remedia* and the vast majority of poems in the *Amores*, eros in these tales is not subjective, is not set in the world of contemporary Rome and is not a kind of game.

---

[72] For links to and differences from his prior compositions in the *Fasti* see 2.3ff., 4.1ff. and MILLER 1991 21ff. *Amor* and its cognates figure in connection with these rapes at 1.425, 2.331, 356, 585, 606, 762, 778, 779, 805 and 4.597.

[73] Erotic subject matter is also present, but is not prominent, in the lines on Attis (4.223ff.) and Castor and Pollux (5.699ff.).

[74] The remarks that follow in this section are made with specific reference to the rape narratives, but most of what I say also applies in the case of 3.461ff. and 677ff. On love generally in the *Fasti* see further TOOHEY 136ff.

On a broader level we can see here something of a new phase for elegiac *amor* generally.[75] It is no longer the preeminent theme but is splintered and very much overshadowed by the other subject matter of the *Fasti*. It takes the form of purely sexual desire in the vast majority of cases (affection and/or love are only intimated in connection with Dis and Zephyrus, who marry their victims). It now has a new violent stress (all the rapes) and much more serious ramifications (cultic practice, change of status, death etc.). It also has a darker tinge: the males are now usually more dominant and brutal; and in the lines on Lara and Callisto, in the long story of Lucretia and for much of the very long Proserpine narrative passion now involves real cruelty and pain, deep misery and humiliation, and horror, tragedy and even death. Divinities crowd out humans too, reversing the former proportions. And many of the stock characters, imagery and themes of amatory elegy and love poetry in general have been dropped. However, Ovid also makes a point of giving some of them fresh and invigorating twists. So there is a novel touch in connection with *militia amoris* (love as warfare) when *Iuppiter invictus* 'invincible Jupiter' is depicted as *victus* 'conquered' by desire for Juturna (2.585). The party (with all its erotic associations) receives a mythical and farcical reworking in the Lotis and Vesta accounts. The disdainful *dura puella* ('hard-hearted girl') lives again in Cranae (6.120), who has an unprecedented way of disappointing her admirers and receives an unprecedented come-uppance. Zephyrus and Janus with their bountiful divine gifts can be seen as higher manifestations of the *dives amator* ('rich lover'). And there is much play with *furtivus amor* ('furtive love') in the form of risible Priapus and Faunus, heartless Sextus and ingenious Mars, who uses his divine power to conceal his *furta* (3.22) by keeping Rhea Silvia asleep while he has intercourse with her.[76] *Amor* in Latin elegy had never been quite like this before.

---

[75] The treatment of love in the *Metamorphoses* has several aspects in common.

[76] See also pp. 168f.

CHAPTER FOUR

OVID AND VIRGIL

The single most important influence on Ovid in these narratives is Virgil, and again and again proper understanding of the Virgilian allusion is vital for full and informed appreciation of a passage. A massive amount has been written about Ovid's connection with this predecessor, mainly with regard to the *Metamorphoses*,[1] but valuable work has also been done on reminiscences in the *Fasti*, especially with respect to individual sections.[2] However, so far there has been no overview of Ovid's use of and relationship with Virgil in the *Fasti* and no comprehensive survey of the numerous techniques of allusion in evidence there. Taking into account recent advances in intertextuality,[3] this (necessarily long and involved) chapter attempts to cover those aspects with particular reference to the mythical and legendary narratives (although most of what is said in it will also be relevant to the rest of the poem).

---

[1] For bibliography see SUERBAUM 59–61, HOFMANN 2204f. and ALBRECHT 1987 909; subsequent to them cf. especially BEWS, NEUMEISTER, SOLODOW 110–56, ALBRECHT 1990, HARDIE 1990, STEUDEL 76–124, TISSOL 1993, BARNES 257–67, PERUTELLI, O'HARA, BALDO, MUSGROVE and MYERS 1999 195f.

[2] See RAMAGLIA, LAMMACHIA 312–4, DÖPP 60–76, LITTLEWOOD 1980 305–14, MCKEOWN 1984 171f., PORTE 144–50, SCHILLING 1990 = SCHILLING 1993 I 19–51, SCHUBERT, FANTHAM 1992b, BRUGNOLI-STOK and BARCHIESI 1997 21f. and 164–6. I have gratefully taken over various instances of allusion from these critics (and also from BÖMER and FANTHAM 1998), but I have also added many new examples not spotted by earlier scholars. The interpretation of the point of the reminiscences is also largely my own.

[3] Out of a vast bibliography see especially WEST-WOODMAN, CONTE, LYNE 100ff., GARNER, FARRELL, PLETT, FOWLER 1997, HINDS 1998, GALE 2ff., 113ff., THOMAS 1999 and EDMUNDS. There are many competing theories and methods. My own approach is eclectic, and I try to avoid jargon and waffle and agonizing over precision of terminology. I belong in the camp of those who believe that ancient authors like Ovid deliberately utilized other texts in the expectation that readers would perceive that there is a relationship with those texts and that the comprehension of that relationship is of importance for appreciation. I speculate about Ovid's intentions. We can, of course, never be absolutely sure about an author's intentions, and Ovid may well have had other purposes too, but the aims posited in this chapter seem to me highly probable and consistently in evidence. Literary criticism necessarily involves interpretation and is not an exact science. I do try not to be too subjective or over-subtle and not to read too much in. Although intertextual critics are loth to admit this, sometimes echoes seem to have no particular point or purpose, and some of them may even be unconscious or coincidentally similar.

Ovid utilizes Virgil for a wide variety of purposes—to pay tribute to a great predecessor, to probe the issue of genre, to raise aesthetic and ideological differences, to show off his *doctrina* (learning), to provide intellectual entertainment, to inject subtle point, to deceive the reader, to give added bite and so on. Overall I have noted two main thrusts in Ovid's employment of Virgilian material. First of all he seems to be having a lot of fun. Although by no means all of the reminiscences are light-hearted (for example, see footnote 8 below on the sombre effect in connection with Remus' ghost at 5.451ff.), very often Ovid was being flippant, impudently playing around with his revered source and slyly mocking venerable figures such as Aeneas and Dido. Secondly, Ovid seems to be parading and challenging his own cleverness, inventiveness and ability to ring the changes, by inverting, condensing, expanding, providing a sequel or prequel and so forth.[4] Endlessly imaginative, Ovid does a great range of things with his model, and often does several things at once, with a density of reference that is at times kaleidoscopic and invites readers to lose themselves in pursuing echoes, variations and ramifications. There is a patent tour-de-force element in all this (far more so than in Ovid's use of Livy); and if Ovid generally lacks Virgil's seriousness and profundity, a cerebral aspect is still very much evident in the dexterity and complexity of allusion (although at times he may appear to be too fond of his own ingenuity and unable to leave well enough alone).

Ovid's relationship with Virgil is rather involved. Elsewhere he evinces respect for him, writing that his poetry will be read as long as Rome is capital of the world, that the *Aeneid* is the most renowned poem in Latin and that Virgil is the supreme poet of the Aeneadae.[5] The very frequency of references to Virgil's works in the *Fasti* is a tribute to him, a tacit admission of his stature and importance and a sign that he is very much part of Ovid's poetic world. And when Ovid employs Virgil to raise the tone or achieve a tragic effect he is in effect acknowledging Virgil's sublimity and mastery of pathos. But Ovid also often exploits Virgil for mock-solemnity, and for adroit and witty twists. This does intimate that Virgil's poetry is so famous that echoes of it would be easily recognizable (and readily arouse a smile and appreciation of such Ovidian twists), but it does also mean that Ovid is being irreverent and gently guying someone whose gravity must have made him a tempting mark. So too (as we will see below) at times Ovid corrects Virgil and implicitly criticizes him (twitting him or seriously finding fault with him for being too melodramatic etc.), and he even tries to outdo him for short bursts (topping him over details and filling in gaps left by him). Ovid does not imitate slavishly but really engages with Virgil, adopting and adapting intelligently. There seems to be some ambitious rivalry[6] and there may even be a touch of envy and resentment towards *the* Roman poet, the big name with a potentially stifling influence. Certainly Ovid parades his independence, doing things his own way and demonstrating that Virgil's is not the only valid approach to mythical narratives (although even while reacting against his predecessor Ovid is, of course, by means of the very variation betraying the great impact on him of Virgil's poetry).

---

[4] Cf. *A.A.* 2.128 (of Odysseus) *ille referre aliter saepe solebat idem* 'he was accustomed to tell the same tale again and again in a different way'.

[5] *Am.* 1.15.25f., *A.A.* 3.337f., *Ex P.* 3.4.83f.

Techniques in Isolation

Ovid was steeped in Virgil, clearly fascinated with him and simply unable to leave him alone. He picks up Virgilian words, phrases, lines, passages, characters, episodes and books, constantly and often with extended allusion. Because of the massive extent and complicated nature of the Virgilian reminiscences there are problems over the presentation of material, and some passages will have to be visited more than once to bring out different intertextual aspects. Although (as we will see) different techniques are often combined in passages and even in individual lines, initially it will be helpful to isolate and study separately (for the most part) the more noteworthy and common techniques of allusion.[7]

---

[6] Compare *Rem.* 395f., where he claims that elegy owes as much to him as epic owes to Virgil.

[7] Some intertextual critics talk of allusion when there are only slight correspondences between text and pre-text (supposed source). I am with those scholars who look for clear and substantial indications, such as significant verbal similarities, repetition of words in the same place in the line, close links in context and clustering of common details and motifs. I have tried to be properly critical and cautious in my assessment of deliberate reminiscence, and I have consistently consulted the PHI 5.3 disk to verify my findings.

Apposite Associations

Ovid frequently exploits Virgilian material for its apposite associations. At 3.737ff., when telling of the discovery of honey, he builds up a suitable ambience by working in clear echoes of *Georgics* 4. 151 at lines 740–2 and by including at 750 *corticibusque cavis* ('and hollow bark'), which recalls *corticibus cavatis* at *Georgics* 4.33 and especially *corticibusque cavis* (also in connection with bees) at *Georgics* 2.453 (the only prior instances of such phraseology; there is also an element of tease here: see pp. 283f.). At the start of his account of the creation of Urion/Orion (from divine urine) and his eventual death, an obvious borrowing from *Eclogue* 2.66 in *Fasti* 5.497 generates the required rustic flavour and also, more subtly, has apt serio-comic connotations (given the nature of that poem of Virgil's). A more intricate example occurs at 4.459. After Dis has carried Persephone off to the Underworld (crying out for her beloved mother), the distraught Ceres searching for her is likened to a cow that has lost its calf: *ut vitulo mugit sua mater ab ubere rapto* ('as its mother lows when a calf has been torn from the udder'). The phrase *ab ubere raptus* ('torn from the udder') occurs elsewhere (also at the end of a hexameter) only at Virgil *Aen.* 6.428 (of *wailing* infant *children* in the *Underworld, separated from their mothers* by death) and 7.484 (with *matris* 'mother'), of Silvia's pet stag, which was *greatly loved* and was discovered and wounded through the action of a creature from the *Underworld* (Allecto), causing Silvia *deep distress*.[8]

Elevation

As part of his lurid and powerful description of screech-owls, at 6.140 Ovid refers to their habit of screeching horribly (*horrendum stridere*) at night. Elsewhere in Latin *horrendum stridere* appears only in Virgil, at *Aen.* 9.632 (of the dreadful whirr of an arrow) and 6.288 (of the

---

[8] BÖMER II 248 notes the connection with *Aen.* 6.428 but not that with 7.484. At 5.451ff. there seems to be a cluster of Virgilian reminiscences. 451 calls to mind *Aen.* 3.67f. and thus Polydorus' terrible tragedy (*condo* with a noun meaning 'ghost' or 'soul' appears there only before Ovid). 460 is rather like *Aen.* 2.274 of the horribly mangled Hector (where *qualis eram/erat* is also applied to a dead person seen in a vision). 476 recalls *Aen.* 2.793 and 6.701 (the only anterior instances of *manus effugere* applied to a spirit) and so acquires extra pathos from Aeneas' futile attempts to clasp his beloved wife and father.

Hydra of Lerna). Although the former instance has a fitting aura of sudden death from the air (the arrow killed a warrior), the latter is even more apposite, deftly raising the status of the screech-owls to that of a (terrifying, lethal and almost invincible) mythical monster[9] and magnifying the deed of Cranae, who subsequently puts an end to their attack on the infant Proca.

In his account of the fall of Gabii Ovid has Sextus (the eventual agent of the town's capture) make his way into the midst of the men of Gabii and pretend to be fleeing from maltreatment by his father and brothers. When the enemy draw their swords, Sextus' response is as follows (2.693f.): *'occidite' dixit 'inermem:/ hoc cupiant fratres Tarquiniusque pater'* ('he said: "Kill an unarmed man: that's what my brothers would want and so would my father Tarquinius"'). Several scholars[10] are reminded here of Virgil *Aen.* 2.103f., where Sinon in the course of winning over the Trojans says: *iamdudum sumite poenas:/ hoc Ithacus velit et magno mercentur Atridae* ('take your revenge now after all this time: the Ithacan would want this and the sons of Atreus would pay a lot for it'). Here context as well as expression is relevant. In both cases an unarmed and cunning speaker in the midst of the enemy asks for death, saying that a single figure and a pair of characters would want that; in both cases the enemy feel pity, accept the man's lying tale that he is the victim of persecution and take him into their city, where he subsequently unleashes death. The consequences of this parallelism have not been pursued hitherto, but as a result of it Sextus is raised to the level of the arch-deceiver Sinon (making him seem even more odious, insidious and deadly),[11] and there is an intimation that the downfall of the little town of Gabii is on a par with the destruction of mighty Troy itself, investing that relatively minor incident with an epic resonance and a deeply tragic mood.[12]

---

[9] Compare the association between them and the Harpies at 6.131f. Note also that the multiple screech-owls are linked to the Hydra with its multiple heads.

[10] E.g. SOFER 9, HEINZE 342, PIGHI 20 and LE BONNIEC 1969 103.

[11] The fact that Sinon was a lying Greek may pick up obliquely Livy's remark (1.53.4) that Gabii was taken by un-Roman trickery.

[12] There are many other examples of such elevation. For instance, at 2.195ff. Virgilian references are employed to give the Fabii an heroic stature (see pp. 185f.); at 2.413–20 echoes of *Aen.* 8.630ff. dignify Ovid's account of the wolf's nurture of Romulus and Remus (see LAMMACHIA 312ff.); at 2.489f. a reminiscence of *Aen.* 9.106 raises the tone for the deification of Romulus (compare LE BONNIEC 1969 75); and at 4.249ff. various Virgilian allusions build up Cybele and her voyage (see footnote 58 below).

Foreshadowing

A more subtle technique is foreshadowing. Ovid often works into his narratives an early reminiscence of Virgil to prefigure further Virgilian allusion, and sometimes he plays with the initial echo in the same way that he will play with the later ones. So at 3.288 *pectora terror habet* 'fear grips the hearts' appears to be taken from *Aen.* 11.357 and to usher in the immediately following extended reference to the encounter between Aristaeus and Proteus in *Georgics* 4 (on which see pp. 137ff.). So too a major alteration to and a major omission from that encounter in another version of it at 1.376ff. are preceded by various minor alterations and omissions at 1.363ff. (for which see pp. 109f., 126).

We can at this point go into more detail over 4.641ff. There the crops fail and animals die during birth, so Numa goes to the god Faunus for help and is advised (rather ambiguously) to sacrifice a pregnant cow; when he does this, fertility is restored to the land and the livestock. Numa's consultation of Faunus at 4.649ff. clearly looks to *Aen.* 7.81ff.: there too a perplexed king (Latinus) consults the god in a sacred grove, sacrificing sheep and lying on their skins, and gets a helpful but not entirely clear response; and in addition to the parallels in overall situation and individual elements there are verbal similarities.[13] But there is also inversion. This is evident in the reaction of the kings' spouses to the pronouncements of Faunus: Numa's wife helpfully explains the god's puzzling words, whereas Amata was enraged and caused much trouble when Latinus (himself) interpreted the god's command to marry Lavinia to a stranger as a reference to Aeneas. Inversion is also evident in the outcome of the consultations: in Virgil the lengthy war in Italy with much slaughter and misery ensued, but in the *Fasti* there is immediate relief, as the famine promptly ends and the crops and animals no longer die. Ovid included a slick signpost for all this at 4.641f.: *fructu non respondente labori,/ inrita decepti vota colentis erant* ('the harvest not answering to the [farmers'] labour, the tillers were cheated and their prayers were futile'). The context of farmers and their crops and the use in this connection of *respondeo* and *votum* call to mind Virgil *Georgics* 1.47f.: *illa seges demum votis respondet avari/ agricolae bis quae solem, bis frigora sensit* ('that field which has twice felt the sun and twice [felt] the cold finally answers to the greedy farmer's prayers'). The Virgilianism at 4.641f. foreshadows the allusion to *Aeneid* 7 and also the inversion of it (for in the *Georgics* passage the land does respond to the farmer's prayers and (1.49) produces huge harvests, whereas in Ovid it does not and there is a famine).

---

[13] See FANTHAM 1998 215f.

Reader Deception

But as well as helpfully prefiguring, Ovid is perfectly capable of mischievously trying to mislead his readers, so that one always has to be on one's toes. So in two cases he suggests that he will provide a full and detailed depiction of combat (between gods, and between heroes), but is in fact playing a rather intricate game. Unreflecting readers will simply be taken in and expect to be shown the fighting. More sophisticated ones might suspect that such expectations will be frustrated, as this is an elegiac work, not an epic poem; but they could not be sure, because Ovid was quite ready to cross generic borders and had in fact already described combat at 1.565ff. (Cacus) and 2.205ff. (the Fabii). The first example of this trickery occurs at 3.795ff., where he tells how the Kite came to be a star in heaven in an account which is without parallel in Classical literature. Ovid encourages anticipation of a substantial narrative in grand style of a major battle. First, a banished and enraged Saturn stirs up the powerful Titans. Next reference is made to a mysterious bull-serpent, which was shut up behind a triple wall in a dark grove by Styx on the orders of the Fates. Then, in accordance with an oracle that whoever burned the entrails of that monster would be able to conquer the immortal gods, the giant Briareus sacrifices it and is about to put the entrails on the fire. The triple wall plays a significant role in the heightening of expectations since the only other instance of Ovid's expression for it, *triplici muro* (3.801), occurs at *Aen.* 6.549 (of the wall surrounding the great bastion of Tartarus). The phrase has an epic gravity and suggests a prison as strong as Tartarus itself, one needed to contain something as terrible as the denizens of Tartarus. But after all this build-up, in 3.807f. the kite simply pinches the entrails and takes them to Jupiter, and the narrative is abruptly terminated. Not only does a small bird settle this massive power-struggle but also the brief and bathetic conclusion means that the account is in fact only 14 lines long and our anticipation of something greater is frustrated.[14]

A book later, as I see it, Ovid has the cheek to try a similar but rather more elaborate trick, when he recounts the duel between Aeneas and Mezentius at 4.879ff.:

> Turnus an Aeneas Latiae gener esset Amatae
> bellum erat: Etruscas Turnus adorat opes. 880
> clarus erat sumptisque ferox Mezentius armis,
> et vel equo magnus vel pede maior erat;
> quem Rutuli Turnusque suis adsciscere temptat
> partibus. haec contra dux ita Tuscus ait:
> 'stat mihi non parvo virtus mea: volnera testor 885
> armaque, quae sparsi sanguine saepe meo.
> qui petis auxilium, non grandia divide mecum
> praemia, de lacubus proxima musta tuis.
> nulla mora est operae: vestrum est dare, vincere nostrum.
> quam velit Aeneas ista negata mihi!' 890
> adnuerant Rutuli. Mezentius induit arma,
> induit Aeneas adloquiturque Iovem:
> 'hostica Tyrrheno vota est vindemia regi:
> Iuppiter, e Latio palmite musta feres.'
> vota valent meliora: cadit Mezentius ingens 895
> atque indignanti pectore plangit humum.
> venerat Autumnus calcatis sordidus uvis:
> redduntur merito debita vina Iovi.

> There was a war to decide whether Turnus or Aeneas was to be Latin Amata's son-in-law; Turnus appealed for Etruscan assistance. Mezentius was a famous and fierce man-at-arms, mighty on horseback, mightier on foot. The Rutuli and Turnus tried to win him to their side. In response to that the Etruscan commander said: 'My bravery costs me not a little: witness my wounds and my arms, which I have often spattered with my blood. You who ask for my support, share with me the next new wine from your vats (not an enormous reward). There is nothing to impede my help: your job is to give, mine to conquer. How Aeneas would like that [i.e. my request] to be denied me!' The Rutulians agreed. Mezentius put on his arms, Aeneas put on his and addressed Jupiter: 'The enemy's vintage is vowed to the Etruscan king; Jupiter,

---

[14] Ovid here may well be giving a playful turn to long narratives of wars in heaven by poets such as Hesiod. He may also be having sport with the *recusatio*, specifically the refusal to write an account of an epic battle of the gods (as at *Amores* 2.1.11ff.): here with a novel spin to the *topos* he would actually be writing on such a weighty subject, but using a typically Callimachean miniaturist technique to do so and being flippant as well.

> you will receive the new wine from the vines of Latium.' The better vow prevailed. Massive Mezentius fell and struck the ground with his resentful breast. Autumn came, stained by trampled grapes, and the wine due was paid to deserving Jupiter.

Although Ovid is following a non-Virgilian tradition in which Mezentius demands the new wine as the price of his support for Turnus, there are initially various resemblances to Virgil's version of the combat in the *Aeneid*. To those Virgilian parallels already noted by scholars[15] may be added the ending *induit arma* in 891 (compare *Aen.* 11.6). Lines such as 881f., 885f., 889 and 891f. seem to presage a fierce fight, and reinforcing them the echoes of Virgil hint at a considerable contest like that found in *Aen.* 10.762–908. But then at 895f. the whole duel is breezily reduced to a single (rather dry and bald) couplet. Thus a major and moving episode in the *Aeneid*, filled with drama and pathos, becomes a minor incident with its droll side; and on top of that Lausus is totally omitted (in direct opposition to *Aen.* 10.791ff., where Virgil vowed not to keep silent about such a worthy subject for poetry).[16]

Oppositio in Imitando *and* Variatio

Two techniques which greatly appealed to the ingenious Ovid, *variatio* (any sort of twist given to a model) and *oppositio in imitando* (specifically inversion of a source), frequently co-exist and are intertwined. Simple instances of the latter have already been pointed out in the section on foreshadowing. More complex is *Fasti* 3.597, where Dido's sister Anna has sailed away from Carthage as an exile and is caught in a storm like the one encountered by Aeneas in the first book of the *Aeneid* (on the numerous correspondences between the hero and heroine see pp. 114, 126f.). In that situation Aeneas had said (at 1.94ff.) that those men who had died beneath the walls of Troy were greatly blessed (because they died fighting and not at sea far from their homes). Anna's reaction at 3.597 is very similar: *tum primum Dido felix est dicta sorori* ('then for the first time Dido was called fortunate by her sister'). There is variation in that the lucky person is now female, and a close relative, who died at Carthage, and not while fighting. Also, apart from the fact that Anna of all people (the same Anna who had been distraught at her sister's suicide) calls Dido fortunate, the wording employed wittily inverts (while reversing the order of adjective and noun) the Virgilian tag *infelix Dido* 'unfortunate Dido' found at *Aen.* 1.749, 4.68, 596 and 6.456.

---

[15] See especially FANTHAM 1998 260ff.

[16] For similar attempts at deception by means of allusion see pp. 227f. on 1.363ff. and p. 55 on 5.637f.

There are several examples of these two intertextual techniques at *Fasti* 4.419ff. (on the rape of Persephone). At 4.451–3, after she has been abducted by Dis, her companions shout out for Persephone and when they get no reply fill the mountains with their wailing. The circumstances resemble *Georgics* 4.460f., where Eurydice's companions fill the mountain tops with their cries after she has been killed during a rape attempt, and this resemblance is underlined by means of verbal equivalence (the application of *aequalis* to *chorus* and the whole opening collocation in 451 of *at, chorus aequalis* occur elsewhere only at *G.* 4.460 (also at the start of the line), and *implere montes* of shouts is only found at *G.* 4.461 before Ovid). The echo brings with it some of the heavy pathos of Virgil's account; but at the same time, in line with the tragi-comic nature of this passage in Ovid (on which see pp. 78ff.), there is also adroit and entertaining literary play. There are twists in Persephone's companions not knowing where she is rather than lamenting her death, and in this (unmarried and divine) victim having been carried off alive in a successful rape, not killed in an unsuccessful attempt on her virtue. More interestingly, unlike Virgil's Eurydice, this companion of the mourners will eventually be recovered from the Underworld (after the seeming failure to get her back at 4.603ff.) and will actually return to the upper world; and in Ovid Persephone is herself the victim rather than the queen of the Underworld who imposes conditions on the recovery of the victim as at *G.* 4.487.

Later in his fourth book of the *Fasti* Ovid reverts to the epyllion in the fourth book of the *Georgics* (but to an earlier part of it), and again he makes changes (which here are not just dexterous but also variously effective). At 4.495ff., in her search for her daughter, Ceres comes to a cave, where she promptly yokes serpents to her chariot and drives off over the sea. At *G.* 4.418ff. there was another important cave near the sea approached by a divinity with a rape connection (Proteus, who later tells Aristaeus the story of Eurydice's death); and once more the allusion is highlighted by verbal means (the grouping *est specus exesi* in *F.* 4.495 appears elsewhere in extant Latin literature only at *G.* 4.418f.). Ceres arrives at night (not during the day, like Proteus) and then immediately leaves again (whereas Proteus stayed on in his cavern for a siesta and had a confrontation with Aristaeus). More significantly, the isolation and ignorance of the goddess in Ovid's text is heightened by divergence from the pre-text (Virgil). For the silent Ceres does not have contact with anyone here (in contrast to Proteus, who spoke at length with Aristaeus, whose mother was also nearby), and Ceres does not know what has happened to her daughter (unlike the omniscient prophet Proteus). The differences also mean that Ceres' cave seems more atmospheric: it is not a place for a nap; it is connected with the exotic serpent-chariot rather than the mundane seals with which Proteus turns up at *G.* 4.430ff.; and (as we are informed in 4.496) it is beyond the reach of humans (such as Aristaeus)—in fact not even wild animals could approach it, so that it is more remote, secure and mysterious.[17]

Aemulatio

In the case of Ceres' more impressive cavern inversion and variation shade over into *aemulatio* ('rivalry', i.e. the attempt to outdo one's source). There is similar but more extensive rivalry in connection with another cave (that of Cacus, at 1.551ff.), and I wonder if Ovid doesn't intend a connection between the two, like the long-range links across the *Aeneid*,[18] but in this instance a link between passages topping Virgil. At *Aen.* 8.193ff. Evander describes Cacus and his cavern to Aeneas as follows:

> hic spelunca fuit vasto summota recessu,
> semihominis Caci facies quam dira tenebat
> solis inaccessam radiis; semperque recenti 195
> caede tepebat humus, foribusque adfixa superbis
> ora virum tristi pendebant pallida tabo.
> huic monstro Volcanus erat pater: illius atros
> ore vomens ignis magna se mole ferebat.

> Here, receding a vast distance, was a cavern, occupied by the dreadful figure of half-human Cacus and never reached by the sun's rays; the floor was always warm with fresh blood, and nailed to its proud

---

[17] For further examples of such twists and reversals see 1.259 (cf. *Aen.* 10.838), 3.215 (cf. *Aen.* 2.333f.), 4.449 (cf. *Aen.* 10.1), 467ff. (Ceres' journey across Sicily recalls Aeneas' circumnavigation of it at *Aen.* 3.689ff.: cf. FANTHAM 1998 181ff.) and 555 (cf. *Aen.* 2.302); see also Techniques In Combination below.

[18] E.g. the hunting motif at 1.184ff., 4.69ff. and 151ff.

> doorposts hung the faces of men, pale in disgusting decay. This monster's father was Vulcan: it was his black fires that he belched forth from his mouth as he moved his massive bulk.

At *F.* 1.551ff. Ovid (inspired by Carmentis) presents a description of the monster and his lair that has obvious and extensive similarities, trying (not always successfully, I feel) to surpass Virgil:

> Cacus, Aventinae timor atque infamia silvae,
> non leve finitimis hospitibusque malum.
> dira viro facies, vires pro corpore, corpus
> grande (pater monstri Mulciber huius erat),
> proque domo longis spelunca recessibus ingens, 555
> abdita, vix ipsis invenienda feris;
> ora super postes adfixaque bracchia pendent,
> squalidaque humanis ossibus albet humus.

> Cacus, the terror and disgrace of the Aventine wood, the great bane of neighbours and strangers. This individual's appearance/face was frightful, his might matched his frame, his frame was massive (Mulciber was the father of this monster). For a home [he had] a huge cave whose inner parts stretched far back, a remote one which even wild animals could scarcely find; faces and arms hung fastened above the dooposts, and the ground was uneven/filthy and white with human bones.

Lively and unpredictable as ever, in the midst of an account (of the whole Cacus episode) that condenses Virgil's version and is generally more toned down, Ovid here expands his source slightly to produce a full eight lines (a remarkably lengthy piece of description for these narratives in the *Fasti*) and also goes for something more sensational. His depiction of Cacus is a bit longer and is much more striking, thanks especially to various effects of sound (especially in 553f., where he prefers the alliterating *Mulciber* to Virgil's *Volcanus*) and various points of style (repetition; emphatic position; juxtaposition; chiasmus in 551; the suggestive enfolding of *finitimis hospitibusque* by *non leve . . . malum* in 552; the punchy asyndeton in 553f.). Ovid's cave is even more lonesome and secluded (almost inaccessible to wild animals, never mind the sun's rays), contains so many bones that the ground is white with them[19] and has arms as well as faces fastened up there. In addition, whereas Virgil interwove Cacus and his cave, Ovid separates the two descriptions, ensuring that each has its own undiluted impact, and allocates a balancing four lines to the creature (two on his effect, and two on his appearance and parentage) and four to his cavern (two on its size and inaccessibility, and two on the human remains there). There is impudence in Ovid's attempt to cap one of Virgil's rhetorical flourishes and pawkiness in the neatness here (the improvement on *Virgil's* arrangement, the elegant control of a rampaging monster, and the tidying up of its messy den). There is also *aemulatio* on two levels—Ovid competes with Virgil obviously, but also Ovid's inspirer (see pp. 34f.) is here trying to outdo Virgil's narrator (Evander, her own son).

---

[19] Perhaps with an implication of cannibalism: cf. SCHUBERT 47.

Polemical Engagement

Still more combative (and more cheeky) are those passages in which Ovid rejects, corrects and criticizes material in Virgil. At *Fasti* 1.543ff. Ovid's inspirer Carmentis can be seen to be contradicting and undermining her son Evander's version of the combat between Hercules and Cacus at *Aen.* 8.185ff., but also, of course, Ovid is subverting the credibility of Virgil's narrator and intimating that the Virgilian account was rather histrionic and hyperbolic (and there is delicious irony in *Ovid* making a dig at someone else for going over the top).[20] Again, at *Aen.* 12.139ff. and 878f. Virgil had described Juturna as a goddess (nymph) who presided over lakes and rivers, an honour which Jupiter had given her for taking her virginity. At *F.* 2.585ff. Ovid takes us back to events connected with that loss of virginity and in so doing airily sets the record straight: according to him Juturna was a water nymph all along, and (2.588) initially she frustrated Jupiter's attempts to rape her for a long time by hiding from him in woods and the water of rivers (so when he finally caught her he would hardly have rewarded her by making her mistress of one of her major means of escape).

At 1.363ff. (quoted and translated on p. 134) Ovid presents his rendition of Aristaeus' encounter with Proteus. He tells how Aristaeus lost his bees, was consoled by his mother and directed by her to Proteus for help, with the warning that he should chain the god up to deal with his shape-shifting, and how Aristaeus did as she bid and Proteus after various changes returned to his original form. So far

---

[20] For details of the criticism there see pp. 36f. and 116f.

Ovid has included many of the details and followed the order of events in Virgil's version of this encounter at *G.* 4.317ff., but at 375ff. Ovid suddenly and strikingly departs from his model. Virgil, it appears, got the rest of the story quite wrong! Ovid has taken us right down to the point in Virgil where Proteus pretends not to know what Aristaeus wants and then, when pressed by him, angrily launches into a description of the death of Eurydice (and its aftermath). But at this point in Ovid the (far more helpful) god does not prevaricate and does not need to be pressured. Nor does he roll on Aristaeus eyes blazing with a blue-grey light and unlock his lips (*ora*) while grimly gnashing his teeth (as in *G.* 4.451f.); instead (and far less threateningly) in 375f. he raises his dripping face (*ora*) with its blue beard and mildly enquires if Aristaeus wants to know how to make good the loss of his bees. Ovid also rejects the long speech at *G.* 4.453ff. in which Proteus recounts the death of Eurydice and the unsuccessful attempt by Orpheus to get her back, prior to suddenly leaping into the sea and leaving Aristaeus' mother (Cyrene) to work out what the problem was and put things right. Proteus didn't do that at all. Actually he told Aristaeus briefly (377f.) and clearly to kill and bury in the ground a bullock (from whose putrefied carcase bees were spontaneously generated). So Cyrene was quite beside the point. And she got things wrong anyway, because she told Aristaeus to sacrifice four bulls and four heifers (far more than was necessary) and to leave their bodies above ground in a grove. In addition, it seems that Virgil was strangely unaware that this was the beginning of the sacrifice of bulls as well as the origin of this method of generating bees, so Ovid (at 1.362) carefully remedies that omission by his predecessor. It may even be that by dropping Proteus' rage and deeply tragic account of the Orpheus and Eurydice story Ovid is again impishly implying (with some justification perhaps) that Virgil went too far, with the sensationalism and the heavy, heady pathos. At any rate no doubt it pleased Ovid to correct like this an initially promising but ultimately flawed account by his learned predecessor in his great didactic poem.[21]

---

[21] On Ovidian correction of Virgil here cf. also FANTHAM 1992b 48f.

Parody

Parody, not surprisingly, appealed to Ovid, and he had a tendency to work in with it complicated play to increase the entertainment. At 3.677ff. Mars, improbably in love with Minerva, approaches the goddess Anna Perenna and appeals to her to help him with his suit; she keeps on stringing him along, before finally setting up a rendezvous, in which as a veiled figure she impersonates Minerva and fools the god, until he discovers her true identity when trying to take a kiss. Burlesque adds to the humour. At 3.682, when appealing to Anna Perenna, Mars says: *uror, et hoc longo tempore volnus alo* 'I am inflamed and for a long time have fed this wound'. The line clearly recalls[22] the opening two verses of *Aeneid* 4 (*at regina gravi iamdudum saucia cura/ volnus alit venis et caeco carpitur igni* 'but the queen, long since smitten with a grievous care, feeds the wound with her life blood and is wasted by an unseen fire'). Dido's plausible and tragic love in a major episode in the *Aeneid* is grotesquely equated with Mars' implausible and ridiculous love in a minor incident in the *Fasti*. We are presented with Mars as Dido (an immortal as the all too mortal queen, Venus' lover as Venus' victim), speaking to Anna Perenna (previously identified as Dido's sister Anna), about a love felt by one divinity for another (not about a love inspired in a mortal by a divinity—the subject of Dido's conversation with Anna in the *Aeneid*). There is also wit in using Virgil's words to depict the god of war as wounded himself, and the Dido reference calls to mind another, far more grave divine impersonation (Cupid as Ascanius). After that it is easy to spot further parody of Dido a little later at 685f., where Anna Perenna tricks the god with a hollow promise and prolongs his foolish hope with dubious delays. In similar fashion, after murdering her husband, Dido's brother Pygmalion had tricked her for a long time with empty hope at *Aen.* 1.352.[23] Here again Mars is Dido, but this time an amorous figure of fun is likened to a bereaved figure of great pathos, the gullible Mars to the vulnerable heroine who quite reasonably believed her brother. And, as Ovid incongrously parallels Pygmalion's cruel deception with Anna's mischievous trick, now we see Anna as Pygmalion (her own brother, and the enemy of her beloved sister and of Anna herself),[24] a turn which subtly prefigures Anna's change of role in her disguise as Minerva.

---

[22] In view of the common fire imagery and length of passion and the phrase *volnus alere*, which occurs only at *Aen.* 4.2 prior to Ovid.

[23] Apart from the Mars as Dido connection and the prolonged deception in both cases, *ludo, spes* and the similar adjectives *vanus* and *inanis* are common. Cf. BÖMER II 192.

There is a more ambitious complex at 2.305ff., where Faunus sees Hercules and Omphale out walking one day, promptly falls in love with her and that night decides to force his affections on her as she lies sleeping in a cave (not realizing that she has changed clothes with Hercules).[25] At a very dramatic and sad point in *Aeneid* 4, as Aeneas was getting ready to leave poor Dido despite her appeals, she was forced by her passion to approach her lover again, by means of Anna, and Virgil remarked at 4.412 *improbe Amor, quid non mortalia pectora cogis* ('shameless Love, to what do you not drive mortal hearts?'). At *F.* 2.331, as Faunus decides to make his way to the cave, Ovid recalls the Virgilian line with *quid non amor improbus audet?* ('what does shameless love not dare?'). Ovid thereby transfers Virgil's words to a new low context, in which lust rather than love figures, and an undignified and bungling rapist is driven to approach his beloved himself, for a far more nefarious purpose.[26] As well as being ludicrous, the likening of Faunus to Dido involves a sex-change and a switch of identity which ties in neatly with the cross-dressing by Hercules and Omphale, setting up Faunus as Dido approaching Omphale who is dressed as Hercules and then Hercules who is dressed as Omphale.

There are more of these apposite changes for Faunus. At 333 there is a new turn to the parody. As he enters the cave, Faunus sees his target's companions relaxed with wine and sleep—*somno vinoque solutos*, a phrase which occurs elsewhere only at *Aen.* 9.189 and 236 (in the same metrical *sedes*), of the sleeping enemy through whom Nisus and Euryalus make their way as they break out of the Trojan camp. So this ignominious incident is now equated with one of the most glorious and poignant exploits in the *Aeneid* and this time the rapist is put on a par with two doomed heroes. The scandalous correspondences are extensive. Like them he goes off at night into the midst of the 'enemy' (but he is trying to break in and attack a female, rather than breaking out and attacking males). For him too initially all goes well, but it does so as he reaches Omphale's bed (and he does not capitalize on his success, as the lionskin that she is wearing makes him think that she is Hercules). He too goes astray in the dark, but in so doing tries to rape a warrior (Hercules, under the impression that he is Omphale) rather than killing and plundering warriors. And his adventure also ends in discovery and failure (but a trivial and laughable failure).

---

[24] Cf. 3.573ff.

[25] On the Virgilian allusions here cf. FRÉCAUT 66f. and FANTHAM 1983 195.

[26] Faunus' beloved is female, not male, but he does make an approach to the male Hercules (convinced in the dark by his clothes that he is Omphale) and is rebuffed by him as Anna was by Aeneas. Note also that Ovid shows that love drives immortal hearts too.

With yet another shift the versatile Faunus next becomes Androgeos, the Greek who as Troy was being taken fatally blundered into Aeneas and his companions under the impression that they were Greeks. At 341f., when Faunus touches the skin worn by Omphale and thinks she is Hercules, he is thunderstruck and afraid, and he recoils as a traveller steps back in alarm when he has seen a snake. At *Aen.* 2.378ff., when he realized that he was in the midst of enemies, Androgeos was dazed and drew back, like someone who has stepped on an unseen snake and shrinks back in fear. The similes and their contexts are close, so we have Faunus compared to another doomed hero, but this time one who was killed along with many others (the Greeks with him), and now a solemn epic simile is applied to the botched rape. In addition, in contrast to Androgeos Faunus felt a fear that was in fact inappropriate, and his mistake was amusing and led not to his death but to a sexual assault on the superhero Hercules. As a third momentous and deeply moving moment in the *Aeneid* is parodied, there is cumulative impact in the outrageousness, which here reaches its height as Ovid, at the most comic moment so far in this disreputable affair, mocks Virgilian lines connected with the supremely tragic and horrific fall of Troy.[27]

Simultaneous Virgilian Allusion

With this rather intricate technique an incident or even a single line in Ovid echoes more than one bit of Virgil at the same time (often with some sort of spin). For instance, when the ghost of Dido appears to Anna during her stay with Aeneas and Lavinia, warning her to flee (*F.* 3.639ff.), scholars are quite reasonably reminded of various admonitory visions in Virgil—the one that Dido had of Sychaeus at *Aen.* 1.353ff. and the one that Aeneas had of Hector at *Aen.* 2.270ff. and also the one that Aeneas had of Mercury at *Aen.* 4.556ff.[28] By way of variation, in Ovid it is Dido's sister who is being admonished, by Dido herself, and Anna is urged not just to flee like Aeneas but to flee from Aeneas' home.

---

[27] See p. 135 for the parody at 1.362 of *G.* 4.315f.

A still more involved example is to be found at *F.* 3.569ff. When Anna sails away from Carthage, she initially reaches the island of Melite, where the king hospitably welcomes her and where she stays, until her brother Pygmalion turns up, seeking her in war; the king of the island then tells her to flee, and she does so. Her stay there recalls Aeneas' stay in Thrace (*Aen.* 3.13ff.), because both are the first stops in the two voyages, there are ties of long-standing hospitality in both places (*hospitio . . . vetusto* at *F.* 3.569 and *hospitium antiquum* at *Aen.* 3.15), initially all seems well, later Aeneas and Anna are ordered to flee (*fuge* at *F.* 3.578 and *Aen.* 3.44) and both do as they are told. There is also a greedy and murderous sovereign in common. In the *Aeneid* this was the Thracian king who had killed Priam's son Polydorus for the gold that he had with him, but in the *Fasti* it is Anna's own brother,[29] who is a present (not a past) threat but who does not succeed in his designs. At the same time one thinks of Aeneas' second stop (on Delos): like Melite, Delos is an island, and is described as being near to other islands (*Aen.* 3.76; cf. *F.* 3.567); there too there was a king, who was an old friend and received the Trojans hospitably (*hospitio, Aen.* 3.83); and there too things went well at first, but subsequently the Trojans were warned off and departed. However, Anna, as an elegiac and low-key Aeneas (see pp. 126f.), does not receive the awesome admonition that he had (from Apollo on Delos, and from the dead Polydorus in Thrace). In addition to the deft conflation of Aeneas' first two false starts (which are now seen to be more similar than we might have realized before reading Ovid), the king of Melite's offer of his land to Anna at 3.572 is reminiscent of Dido's offer of her city to the Trojans at *Aen.* 1.573, and the threatening presence of Pygmalion at 3.577 picks up talk of his menace in the *Aeneid* at 4.325f. and especially 4.44 (where Anna speaks fearfully of *germani . . . minas* 'the threats of my brother'—here her fears come true). Ovid may also have slipped in a hint of another island with negative associations (Tenedos, from which Laocoon's snakes and the Greek fleet came), if his *opum dives* 'rich in wealth' in 3.570 looks to Virgil's *dives opum* of Tenedos at *Aen.* 2.22 (the sole surviving instance of the phrase before Ovid).

---

[28] See e.g. BÖMER II 189, DÖPP 74, LITTLEWOOD 1980 314, MCKEOWN 1984 171, 237, PORTE 148 and BRUGNOLI-STOK 38f.

[29] For Pygmalion's avaricious and murderous nature see *Aen.* 1.348ff.

At *F.* 1.527f. there is a striking case of compression (in the midst of expansion: see pp. 127f.) in connection with this technique. On her arrival in Latium with Evander, Carmentis greets the deities of the land and then launches into a long prophecy about future events connected with it. Towards the end of it she says: *iam pius Aeneas sacra et, sacra altera, patrem/ adferet* 'now dutiful Aeneas will bring here his sacred gods and another sacred burden, his father'. In just over a line of verse Ovid there elegantly combines with the Virgilian tag *pius Aeneas* references to two prime examples of Aeneas' *pietas* (sense of duty) famous from Virgil—taking Troy's gods with him on his voyage to Italy (*Aen.* 2.293 etc.) and carrying his aged father on his shoulders out of the burning Troy (*Aen.* 2.717ff.). Ovid may even be playing with the idea of Aeneas bearing Anchises on his shoulders while his father had the *sacra* in his hands (cf. *Aen.* 2.717). He may also have *Aen.* 1.378f. particularly in mind (where Aeneas says: *sum pius Aeneas, raptos qui ex hoste Penatis/ classe veho mecum* 'I am dutiful Aeneas, who bear with me on my ships the Penates snatched away from the enemy); if so, Ovid would be condensing the reference to the gods, while also working in Anchises, and still using fewer words than Virgil. Add to that the fact that this is part of Ovid's expansion of Virgil's brief mention of Carmentis at *Aen.* 8.333ff.,[30] giving her a prominence that she does not have in Virgil, and in so doing using the *Aeneid* to provide a suitable flavour for his supplement to the *Aeneid*. For the simultanous allusion here is just part of a prophecy of the type often found in Virgil's epic poem. But at the same time Ovid tries to outdo his predecessor. There had been no prophecy in Virgil about Aeneas carrying the gods and his father, so a gap is filled in there. And Ovid is far more stylish than Virgil ever was in connection with Aeneas (all the assonance and alliteration; the pointed repetition of *sacra*; and the eloquent word order whereby Aeneas is enfolded by and in contact with *pius* and *sacra*). This is 'Ovid at his most Ovidian', as one Virgilian critic[31] remarked rather sourly; and that, I suspect, is just the sort of reaction that Ovid was aiming at.

---

[30] On this expansion see pp. 127ff.

Contaminatio

There are various aspects to this favourite technique (whereby Ovid combines reminiscences of Virgil and other sources within a passage or a line or even a phrase). Scholars[32] have already established that Ovid's verses on Hercules' battle with Cacus at 1.543ff. are heavily indebted to *Aen.* 8.185ff. But he also has an eye there to other accounts (in Livy 1.7.4ff., Propertius 4.9 and perhaps Dio. Hal. 1.39). In common with them Ovid does not have a grandiose description of the ruins of the cliff that covered Cacus' cave such as is found at *Aen.* 8.190ff., and he does not (as Virgil did) depict Hercules as blazing with gall when he discovers the loss of his cattle or Cacus fleeing in terror or Hercules frustrated a full three times in his initial attempts to penetrate Cacus' lair and then tearing off the cavern's roof to get at him, and he does not have Cacus rather theatrically throttled by Hercules with his bare hands (instead, as in Livy, Prop. and Dio. Hal., Ovid's Hercules uses his club). Like Livy and Dio. Hal., Ovid states specifically that Hercules was asleep while the cattle were stolen by Cacus (the circumstances are unclear in Virgil) and makes Hercules wake up the next day and spot that some are missing (he is strangely unaware of his loss in the *Aeneid*). There are similarities in diction too: like Livy at 1.7.5, Ovid (at 1.550, 570) describes Cacus as *ferox* 'ferocious'; Ovid's *de numero tauros sentit abesse duos* 'he perceived that two bulls were missing from the full number' (1.548) resembles *partem abesse numero sensisset* 'he perceived that some were missing from the full number' at Livy 1.7.6; and *traxerat aversos Cacus in antra ferox* 'ferocious Cacus had dragged them [the cattle] backwards into his cave' at 1.550 is very like Prop. 4.9.12 *aversos cauda traxit in antra boves* 'he dragged the cattle backwards by the tail into his cave'. Ovid is adroitly blending prose and verse here, mixing history, epic and aetiological elegy (in his own aetiological elegy).[33] He is also mischievously undermining Virgil's account by means of this *contaminatio*—improving the logic (in connection with the loss of the cattle during the hero's sleep and his noting of the loss), reminding us that there are other versions too, and actually privileging those non-Virgilian sources (there is allusion to Livy and Propertius in 548 and 550, before the first echo of Virgil at 553ff.). In line with those other models Ovid also produces a shorter and more low-key passage than Virgil, and in following them he tones down the extremes of the *Aeneid*. There is again the irony of Ovid thereby tacitly intimating that Virgil overdid things. But at the same time Ovid is also reacting against Livy, Propertius and Dio. Hal. here: he produces something much more dramatic and exciting than they did by taking over some material from Virgil (e.g. Cacus as a fire-breathing monster, his grisly cave and the great battle with him). So there is actually two-way criticism here (Virgil takes things too far, while Livy and company are too dull and pedestrian), and Ovid (of all people) is showing moderation, artfully manoeuvering between the two traditions to produce his own narrative.

---

[31] AUSTIN 1964 264. This is, of course, all very apt for a goddess whose name is connected with *carmen* 'prophecy, poetry' (cf. SCHILLING 1993 I 108).

[32] See especially SCHUBERT and MERLI 2000 283ff. (who points out some differences from Virgil in Ovid's account).

On a smaller scale, I suspect strongly that Ovid at 2.441 has in mind both Virgil and Catullus. At 2.429ff. the abducted Sabine women only seldom give birth, so the Romans go to a grove of Juno, and its tree-tops tremble as the goddess says to them: *Italidas matres . . . sacer hircus inito* 'let a sacred goat penetrate the Italian matrons'. What the goddess actually means is that the women should be lashed with thongs of goat-hide, but at first sight it looks as if she is actually suggesting copulation with a goat. The line is serious on the surface, but it does also have this obscenely comic aspect, deflating the solemnity in connection with the numinous grove in 435f. and 439f., and reinforcing the basic humour of the background situation (all the effort having been expended on the famous Rape of the Sabine Women for nothing). *Sacer hircus* occurs at only two other places in surviving Latin before this. At *Georgics* 2.395 Virgil had spoken of the offering of a goat to Bacchus in thanks for and/or to ensure fruitfulness, and there too the sacred goat (in the same position in the hexameter) was associated with fertility, and there was a religious context and the notion of divine kindness. The double entendre in Ovid subverts all that; and so does something else. *Sacer hircus* had been used with a different sense and application in Catullus 71, a poem which concerns somebody's rival who suffers from both gout and stinking armpits, so that whenever he has intercourse with the unfaithful girlfriend he punishes them both—her with the smell and himself with the pains of gout. The man's goatish stench is described in the first line as *sacer alarum . . . hircus*[34] 'an accursed goat of the armpits'. Whether the fact that Catullus had used this phrase earlier slipped Virgil's mind or he chose to ignore it, I believe that Ovid is here resuscitating and exploiting the Catullan connection and its connotations (there is a neat link in that the phrase there is humorous, has a sexual context and conjures up the picture of the girl having sex with the goat of the armpits).[35] It is tempting to see such simultaneous allusion because it would be so very clever and witty, i.e. typical of Ovid.[36]

---

[33] Though, unlike Propertius, Ovid and his inspirer (Carmentis) never do get around to their *aetion* (the origin of the Carmentalia). For further differences from Propertius see MERLI 2000 267ff.

A more elaborate example of *contaminatio* appears at 1.523–6, where Carmentis, newly arrived in Latium, prophesies the resurgence of Troy there in the form of Rome:

> victa tamen vinces eversaque, Troia, resurges:
>   obruit hostiles ista ruina domos.
> urite victrices Neptunia Pergama flammae: 525
>   num minus hic toto est altior orbe cinis?

> However, after being conquered you will conquer, Troy, and after being overthrown you will rise again: your ruins crush/overwhelm the homes of your enemies. Victorious flames, burn down Neptune-built Troy: surely its ashes do not tower any the less over the whole world?

Common words and details[37] make it clear that there is allusion here to *Aen.* 2.624f. (*omne mihi visum considere in ignis/ Ilium et ex imo verti Neptunia Troia* 'it seemed to me that all Ilium sank into flames and Neptune-built Troy was overthrown from her base') and also to *Aen.* 3.3 (*omnis humo fumat Neptunia Troia* 'all Neptune-built Troy smoked from the ground'). Those words in Virgil were spoken by a despondent male (Aeneas) to a female (Dido) after the event and with regret, whereas in Ovid we find a triumphant female prior to the event prophesying it and actually welcoming it. More than that, she predicts recovery (from being overthrown Troy will rise again, and after being levelled to the ground as a smoking mass its ashes will tower over the whole world). So Carmentis knows better than Aeneas, and employs his own words in the process of capping him, speaking in his promised land (and in the elegiac metre), and inverting his negative picture in the course of a prophecy very much in the manner of the *Aeneid*. There is also clear allusion[38] in 1.523 to the prophetic statement in Prop. 4.1.87 (*Troia cades, et Troica Roma resurges* 'Troy, you will fall and rise again as Trojan Rome'). At the same time that Virgil is topped, Propertius is also topped: Carmentis' expression is more vatic (more paradoxical), she works in fall and recovery twice (rather than just once), she improves on resurgence with conquering, and her Latin is more elegant (the juxtaposition of *vinces* and *eversaque*, the placement of *victa* and *resurges* in tension at either end of the line).[39]

---

[34] This is an emendation, but it is accepted by all modern editors.

[35] Cf. Catull. 69.8.

[36] And Ovid does the same type of thing at 1.519, which obviously echoes *Aen.* 4.657f., but also recalls Catull. 64.171f. (also spoken by a woman, with a disyllabic word for ships at the end of the line, suggestively juxtaposed with *litora* and furnished with a geographical epithet).

[37] Namely *(e)verto, Troia, Neptunius* applied to a name for Troy (there only before Ovid), Troy in ruins and the flames/smoke.

Interfigurality

It is time to broaden the picture and move on to characters. Interfigurality is the name given to the process whereby an author takes over a figure from a source and re-uses it, often with some sort of modification.[40] Out of various Virgilian characters in the *Fasti* the reappearance of several from the *Aeneid* is most noteworthy. Change is very much in evidence. Ovid allows himself great freedom, contracting or expanding roles, presenting a new take, employing heroes and heroines for novel purposes and so on. The *Fasti* is, of course, not the same kind of composition as Virgil's epic and it does not have the same focus or interests, but there do seem to be other reasons for the differences beyond the nature of Ovid's poem—for example, a serious belief that Virgil did not quite get something right, and the wish to be independent, to provide intellectual exercise and to have some sport.

---

[38] The fall and resurgence in one and the same hexameter verse, the address to the city, *resurges* at the end of the line. Ovid may also be looking to Prop. 4.1.47.

[39] Among many more examples of *contaminatio* see pp. 139f. and 185f., and note that at 4.459 the Virgilian expression *ab ubere rapto* (mentioned on p. 100) is combined with a Lucretian picture of a cow (FANTHAM 1998 179) and at 4.649ff. the Virgilian consultation of Faunus (discussed earlier on pp. 102f.) contains in it a reminiscence of Tib. 2.1.87ff. (FANTHAM 1998 217).

[40] On interfigurality see especially ZIOLKOWSKI 123ff. and PLETT 101ff.

Aeneas, an important personage in the myth of Rome's origins, might well have had textual prominence in the *Fasti* but in fact is distinctly downplayed. The protagonist of Rome's national epic is here given a minor part; in addition, his standing is reduced, and he is guyed. Ovid may have felt that he just could not compete here with Virgil's Aeneas or have been bored with him or found him unsympathetic and a tempting target. At any rate in re-employing him he took the opportunity to do something different with him and to give rein to his wit and frivolity; and in view of Augustus' connection with Aeneas there may have been a subtly subversive element too.

In contrast to the *Aeneid*, where Aeneas is referred to in the second word of the poem, in the *Fasti* he is not mentioned until line 527 of the first book (and then only briefly and in passing) and he does not put in a major appearance until late in the third book. He plays a part in only two of the extended mythical narratives (3.545ff. and 4.879ff.), and references to him elsewhere are short and infrequent.[41] In those references we find especially the standard *pius Aeneas* ('dutiful Aeneas') of the *Aeneid*, carrying his gods and his father, and taking Trojan deities and rites to Italy, and Ovid appears to be serious and respectful. But it may well be significant that Aeneas there is hardly ever described as a leader[42] and is never depicted as a fighter or a man of destiny with a mission that will lead to the glories of Rome, so that he seems somewhat diminished. So too in the two longer passages Ovid takes a rather different attitude to the hero, one which tends to undermine the tone in the shorter mentions.

At 4.879ff. (quoted and translated on pp. 104f.) there is the playful trick in connection with Aeneas already discussed and the hero's status is deflated. As the climax of *Aeneid* 10 is made into an anticlimax, the major engagement there between Aeneas and Mezentius is reduced to a mere twenty lines (with the actual fight covered in a single couplet). Aeneas himself hardly figures in the passage, appearing in only five lines. The focus is on Mezentius instead: the majority of the lines (and far more detail and description) are devoted to him; he has a longer speech than Aeneas; and he is the one who comes across as the warrior. In fact Aeneas is totally omitted from the duel and Mezentius is defeated thanks to Jupiter (4.895f.), with what looks like a sly twist to Aeneas' famous *pietas* (devotion to the gods etc.), making that responsible for his victory rather than the martial skills evinced in the *Aeneid*.

---

[41] 1.527f., 2.543ff., 680, 3.423f., 4.37, 77ff., 251, 274, 799f., 6.434.

[42] Solely at 2.680.

All of this is even more pronounced in connection with Aeneas' first substantial appearance, at 3.545ff., where we are given a new picture of him in a sequel to the *Aeneid*. The narrative concerns Anna's adventures after the death of Dido and the invasion of Carthage, and Anna rather than Aeneas is the protagonist (in fact, apart from brief allusions in 545 and 549, he does not take the stage until as late as 601 and he drops out completely after 632). There is play with the hero's tribulations during his voyage when Anna here figures as a second Aeneas (also making a false start, at Melite, and also being caught by a storm),[43] and then there is the droll touch of Aeneas as a second Dido (offering hospitality to the shipwrecked Anna when he meets her on his coast, and listening to the tale of her wanderings at 621ff.). Allusion to Dido there and elsewhere conjures up his passionate and doomed love affair with the queen, which is here replaced by a rather mundane (and not unproblematic) marriage to Lavinia. The great hero has become a husband, and we see him in a domestic rather than a martial context—Aeneas among the women, instead of Aeneas the leader of men.

There is trouble when he takes Anna back to his palace at 3.627ff.:

> utque domum intravit Tyrios induta paratus,
> incipit Aeneas (cetera turba tacet):
> 'hanc tibi cur tradam, pia causa, Lavinia coniunx,
> est mihi: consumpsi naufragus huius opes. 630
> orta Tyro est, regnum Libyca possedit in ora:
> quam precor ut carae more sororis ames.'
> omnia promittit falsumque Lavinia volnus
> mente premit tacita dissimulatque metus;
> donaque cum videat praeter sua lumina ferri 635
> multa, tamen mitti clam quoque multa putat.
> non habet exactum quid agat: furialiter odit,
> et parat insidias et cupit ulta mori.

---

[43] See p. 114.

> When she entered his home, wearing her Tyrian attire, Aeneas began (the rest of the group kept silent): 'Lavinia my wife, duty is my reason for entrusting this woman to you: when I was shipwrecked, I used up her resources. She was born in Tyre, she possessed a kingdom on the coast of Libya. I ask you to love her like a dear sister.' Lavinia promised all [of that], suppressing an imagined injury in the silence of her heart and concealing her fears; and even though she saw many gifts conveyed [to Anna] before her eyes, she still believed that many were also sent in secret. She didn't have her course of action worked out. She hated like a Fury, made preparations for a treacherous attack and wanted to get revenge and then die.

At 629ff. there is the tricky business of trying to get a new wife to accept a former girlfriend's sister, and the virtuous Aeneas (clearly embarrassed about his old flame) resorts to obfuscation, making it seem as if it was Anna who was the generous queen at Carthage. His final words at 632[44] are completely ignored by his wife, and comically it seems that his attempt in 629f. to get Anna accepted only aroused suspicions of a past intimacy with her. There is dark humour in Aeneas again sending a female presents which cause amatory trouble (compare the gifts for Dido at *Aen.* 1.709ff.), and also in Aeneas (who was implicated in Dido's death) having a wife who tries to bring about the death of Dido's sister. He hardly emerges from all this as a very grave or impressive personage.[45]

Two other major characters in the *Aeneid* (Turnus and Dido) are minimized and gently mocked. Although neither of them is as obviously relevant to the *Fasti*, more room for them could probably have been found by the inventive Ovid, and he could certainly have showed them more respect in the references to them that he did include. Apart from the designation of Juturna[46] as sister of Turnus in 1.463, the Rutulian is only mentioned at 4.879ff. (on the combat between Aeneas and Mezentius), where he is named in just two lines (880 and 883) and appears not as a mighty warrior but as someone in need of a mighty warrior (a role filled by Mezentius), someone who begs for Mezentius' help and immediately gives in to his demands. In addition, at 2.585ff. there is oblique and frivolous allusion to Turnus' duel with Aeneas.[47] As for Dido, burlesque of Virgilian verses connected with her has already been noted on pp. 111f. She herself only figures at 3.545ff. (Anna's adventures), and there she is not the great queen of the early books of the *Aeneid* but already dead and very much a character of the past, until she briefly intrudes as a ghost at the end (3.639ff.). And she too becomes a vehicle for Ovid's wit: e.g. the tragic affair and suicide of *Aeneid* 1–4 is summed up in just two lines at 545f., with a play on words (*arserat* 'had burned'); and the silent ghost of Dido who fled from Aeneas in *Aeneid* 6.450ff. becomes a vocal ghost who tells Anna to flee from Aeneas' house at 3.641.

---

[44] In addition to the two-edged *carae . . . sororis*, there may well be a playful touch in making *ames* 'love' the final word of Aeneas, the son of Venus, brother of Cupid and lover of Dido. So too Aeneas appears not in hexameters but in elegiac couplets (the metre of love poetry; and the lower generic status of elegy fits with Aeneas' lessened standing in the *Fasti*).

[45] Note also that Aeneas appears in only 51 lines of the whole six books of the *Fasti* and his role as founder of the Roman race is nowhere noted by Ovid, whereas Romulus is mentioned far more often overall and has prominence in a full 7 passages (2.361ff., 383ff., 481ff., 3.11ff., 49ff., 179ff., 4.809ff.), and he rather than Aeneas is presented as the founder figure (the one who built the city, laid down laws, organized the people and senate etc.). Evander also diminishes Aeneas somewhat: at 1.469ff. he is brought to our attention before Aeneas and he usurps the Trojan's role, doing first much of what Aeneas did later (Evander too had a divine mother guiding and helping him, journeyed over the sea as an exile according to the dictates of fate, was a victim of divine wrath, arrived in Latium at the Tiber and received from a parent a prophecy about the coming greatness of Rome). On this oppositional function of Evander and Romulus cf. FANTHAM 1992 and NAGLE 15.

With Evander and Carmentis at *F.* 1.469ff. (concerning their move from Arcadia to Latium) Ovid reverses the relative prominence of the pair in Virgil. At *Aen.* 8.333ff. Evander concludes a speech to Aeneas on the earlier history of Latium with mention of his mother Carmentis and then shows him the gate named after her:

> me pulsum patria pelagique extrema sequentem
> Fortuna omnipotens et ineluctabile fatum
> his posuere locis, matrisque egere tremenda 335
> Carmentis nymphae monita et deus auctor Apollo.'
> vix ea dicta, dehinc progressus monstrat et aram
> et Carmentalem Romani nomine portam
> quam memorant, nymphae priscum Carmentis honorem,
> vatis fatidicae, cecinit quae prima futuros 340
> Aeneadas magnos et nobile Pallanteum.

> 'When I had been driven out from my fatherland and was seeking the furthest limits of the sea, all-powerful Fortune and inescapable fate settled me in this area, and the dread warnings of my mother, the nymph Carmentis, and the authority of the god Apollo, drove me [here].' These

---

[46] On Ovid's re-use of her (in a prequel) see the next section.

[47] See pp. 90f.

> words had scarcely been spoken when he moved on and pointed out the altar and the gate which the Romans call Carmental, a long-standing honour to the nymph Carmentis, the prophetic seer who first foretold that the Aeneadae would be great and Pallanteum would be famous.

Evander was a major player for much of *Aeneid* 8, but in the *Fasti* passage he becomes a distinctly minor one, doing very little, not speaking at all and occupying just a few lines. Carmentis figured in the above verses alone in Virgil's epic, but in Ovid she not only inspires the narrative at 1.469ff. (and the following one at 1.543ff.) but also features in most of that long account (thereby acquiring a new eminence in Latin literature). As inspirer, whereas she had been sandwiched among other influences (which were emphasized by chiasmus and position) towards the end of the speech in Virgil, in Ovid she plays up her own importance in contrast to them (hardly mentioning them at all). She also enhances her status by playing up her importance in contrast to her son, virtually eliding him (as he had virtually elided her in the *Aeneid*), and making herself the active and dominant participant in the whole adventure, foretelling Evander's exile and also overseeing it in every way. In contradistinction to *Aen.* 8, here she is a living presence whose words we actually hear, and she does more than just warn and prophesy—she stiffens her son's resolve, guides his ship, greets the new land of Latium and so on.[48] In fact she usurps his role and is not just Carmentis but a piquant conflation[49] of Carmentis and the king Evander of *Aeneid* 8. For in Ovid she is the one who speaks at length and is in charge (issuing lots of orders), who is wise, experienced and knowledgeable, who is the loving and protective parent with an immature, inexperienced and submissive son; and (at 1.521f.) she is the one who shows affection for Pallas and is apprehensive about his death but also exhibits resignation over it.[50]

Something similar happens in connection with Anna at 3.545ff. From being a lesser figure with just four appearances in book 4 of the *Aeneid* Anna here has her own concentrated and substantial narrative (over 100 lines, which is long for the *Fasti*), and she dominates it as the protagonist (she, rather than her sister, is the suffering heroine who shares the stage with Aeneas and has momentous experiences). There is also conflation of characters again, but this time much more complex conflation. The blending of Anna with Aeneas has already been referred to in this section.[51] But Anna also has something of Venus in her: like the goddess at *Aen.* 1.312ff., Anna encounters Aeneas when he is walking on a coast accompanied by Achates alone and converses with him (at 3.603ff.). And she has rather more of Dido in her: at 613ff. Aeneas speaks to her much as he had spoken to her sister at *Aen.* 6.456ff., and at 639ff. she sees a vision very like that seen by Dido at *Aen.* 1.353ff. More than that, at 3.565f. Anna is within one and the same couplet merged with both her sister and her sister's lover: she acquires a ship and companions and departs into exile as Dido did at *Aen.* 1.360ff., and when she sails off she looks back at the walls of Carthage as Aeneas did at *Aen.* 5.3. Add to all that, as part of the intricate play, the mixture of Aeneas with Dido mentioned above in this section and the conflation of Lavinia, Amata and Dido noted by earlier scholars.[52]

---

[48] And in contrast to the honour of the gate in *Aen.* 8.339, here she ensures greater honour for herself (1.468) by prompting a narrative which shows her to such good advantage.

[49] On conflated characters see GARNER 51ff., FARRELL 106ff. and CLAUSS-JOHNSTON 157ff.

[50] Cf. *Aen.* 8.581, 572ff. and 11.137ff.

Among other important interfigural aspects there is the change in attitude and aims. In place of Virgil's tenderness and sympathy and his employment of Anna for essentially tragic purposes, Ovid is here flippant towards her, having fun with Anna herself and using her to raise a smile in connection with Aeneas and Lavinia (and also to demonstrate his own cleverness). There are also various situational developments. Although she is still basically the rather quiet and colourless Anna of the *Aeneid*, she has new relationships with existing characters in her story (Iarbas becomes a conqueror, Aeneas becomes a host), new figures come into her life (especially Lavinia and Numicius) and her circumstances are transformed drastically (the invasion of Carthage, eventful voyage and change of name and status—to a nymph, with a lover). These are stirring times for little Anna, and although she starts off in the *Fasti* passage as the grieving sister seen at the conclusion of *Aeneid* 4, the last glimpse of her given by Ovid is very different from that given by Virgil—a composed nymph of the Numicius, she is surrounded by joy and celebration rather than misery and lamentation. Finally there is extensive alteration and inversion of role for Anna. Very much in the background as the confidante and supportive sister in the *Aeneid*, she is foregrounded by Ovid and becomes a woman of action in the front line. From being one of the company taken on the voyage to Carthage by Dido, she now takes others on a voyage. After being part of the household that helped the shipwrecked Aeneas, she is shipwrecked and helped herself. Instead of being trusted (by Dido) she is distrusted (by Lavinia). The Anna who fostered her sister's affair with Aeneas is now suspected of having one with him herself. In lieu of offering advice to Dido, she is advised by Dido's ghost. And the one who urged Dido to give in to love and enjoy a union with Aeneas now enjoys a union herself as Numicius' beloved.

---

[51] See further LITTLEWOOD 1980 306, PORTE 145ff. and BARCHIESI 1997 21f.

[52] See MCKEOWN 1984 172, PORTE 148 and BARCHIESI 1997 166. Note also that at *F.* 3.634 Lavinia is reminiscent of Aeneas at *Aen.* 1.209.

Episodes

There are also whole episodes in Ovid that have a Virgilian connection of one sort or another. Quite common is the reprise, whereby Ovid retells a story or incident found in Virgil, but of course, being Ovid, he does not tell it again in the same way. Instances of the straightforward reprise already examined include Aristaeus' encounter with Proteus at 1.363ff., Hercules' combat with Cacus at 1.543ff. and Aeneas' engagement with Mezentius at 4.879ff.[53] From the foregoing discussion of them some standard Ovidian ploys will be evident—abridgement (all three accounts are much briefer overall, and the actual fight with Mezentius is drastically shortened); striking omissions (Lausus, and the story of Orpheus and Eurydice); radical alteration of detail (Proteus becomes helpful, specific and succinct); change of focus (the concentration on Mezentius); and modification of tone (none of the drama and tragedy of the Orpheus and Eurydice tale at 1.363ff.; less sensationalism in the lines on Cacus; the typically humorous aspect to the Mezentius passage).

Sometimes the reprise takes the form of a mirror image, as Ovid retells with a different protagonist, achieving a novel orientation and flavour, and parading his resourcefulness. For example, many of Anna's adventures at 3.545ff. are replays on a lesser (elegiac) scale of Aeneas' exploits.[54] We have already seen[55] how her stay on Melite echoes Aeneas' first two false starts (simultaneously and with variations). At 3.626, after surviving the storm and landing in Latium, she tells Aeneas about her journey so far (*errores exposuitque suos* 'and she described her wanderings'), just as Aeneas had told Dido about his wanderings so far in book 3 of the *Aeneid* (but here a whole book is reduced to less than a single verse, and it may not be coincidental that book 3 is summarized in three words). Rather more involved is 3.581ff., where *Aen.* 1.34ff. is mirrored and the minor heroine Anna outdoes the great hero Aeneas himself. At 581–4 she too voyages as an exile and approaches her goal (Camere, which has its own river, like Latium) when she is diverted from it by a storm, but she gets closer to her destination than Aeneas did (she is merely nine slingshot lengths away), and she gets blown *to* Italy, not away from it. The actual storm is similar to that encountered by Aeneas[56] (if less violent, and free from divine intervention),[57] but again there are diverting twists. For Anna (in 585) the wind drops at the start of this incident, not at the end of it, and there is an ominous calm before the storm, not a welcome tranquillity after it. One of Aeneas' fleet (a ship carrying the Lycians) was sunk with all hands (*Aen.* 1.113ff.). At *F.* 3.600 Anna too loses a vessel, but only after all her people make land; and it is her own ship that sinks, and in fact she only had one ship, so that she is deprived of her whole nautical complement, but still she pluckily keeps going (not helped by heaven either). In addition, the small-scale diminution here of Aeneas (who has not actually figured in Ovid's text so far) prepares the way for the more extensive diminution of him when he does make his first appearance immediately after this at 3.601ff.[58]

---

[53] See the sections on polemical engagement, *contaminatio* and reader deception respectively.

At 1.469ff. we find another type of episode—the expansion. There Ovid fills out the references to Evander's voyage and Carmentis' warnings and prophecy of future glory at *Aen.* 8.333ff. (quoted and translated on pp. 123f.), while also topping Virgil and doing several other clever things. In elaborating on the Virgilian allusion to Carmentis and her son Ovid neatly employs the nymph herself as his inspirer (and she has her own agenda).[59] He combines two short bits of the *Aeneid* (8.333–6 and 8.339–41) into one long passage (in contrast to his normal practice of compressing Virgil, Ovid here turns 7 lines into 74). A few verses from the major episode of Aeneas' visit to the future site of Rome are developed into a substantial narrative in their own right. In particular, whereas the modest Evander in his speech in the *Aeneid* briefly added his recent arrival in Latium as a postscript to the history of the place, a minor event which pales beside Saturn's golden age there, Ovid (prompted by the pushy Carmentis) cuts out the earlier history of Latium completely for concentration on the arrival of Evander and especially the vital Carmentis.

---

[54] Cf. BARCHIESI 1997 21f.

[55] On p. 114.

[56] For 588 cf. *Aen.* 1.85; for 590 cf. *Aen.* 1.87f.; for 591f. cf. *Aen.* 1.84f.; for 592 cf. *Aen.* 1.122f.; for 596ff. cf. *Aen.* 1.93ff.

[57] Cf. DÖPP 62ff.

[58] For more of this kind of reprise see pp. 136ff., and note also that at 4.249ff. Cybele's voyage mirrors that of Aeneas (4.273f. specifically link the two; both are connected with Apollo and his oracle and with an oracular order to seek out a mother; and both start and end at similar spots and have in common several places (such as the Cyclades, Crete and Sicily) passed on the way).

Almost everything in the Virgilian lines is carefully picked up, although Apollo's role does not receive much coverage (to play up her importance, Ovid's inspirer plays down her own inspirer),[60] and Ovid's Carmentis does not forecast the fame of Pallanteum (she puts her stress on Rome, thereby out-Virgiling Virgil in patriotism). Five particular elements in the verses from the *Aeneid* come in for enlargement—Evander's expulsion (1.477ff. clarify by adding a reason for it, and enliven by depicting Evander's reaction to it); the arrival in Latium (caught in vivid detail at 1.499ff.); the nymph's warnings (given immediacy by direct quotation at 1.479ff., and also made into something stiffening rather than frightening); the prophecy (also quoted, with striking expression,[61] at 1.515ff., and doing much more than simply presaging the greatness of the Aeneadae); and above all Carmentis (see pp. 34f.). Ovid is clearly demonstrating that there was much that Virgil could have said and in particular that he could have made much more of Carmentis; and so it may even be that the abridging, irreverent Ovid is getting in a sly dig at Virgil for condensing and not showing enough respect to the goddess.

Two other aspects of this expansion merit attention. At 1.521f., within the hearing of Evander, and in between remarks on the coming of Aeneas from Troy and the new war to be fought in Latium, the nymph addresses her future grandson Pallas, asking him why he is arming, but then urging him to arm, as his death will have a great avenger. One goes back with a fresh perspective from this to *Aen.* 8.514ff. and 578ff., where Evander volunteers his son for the war in Italy and sends him off with misgivings about his survival. There is retrospective intertextuality here.[62] With hindsight there must be definite deflation of Virgil's venerable king if he had already received this information: was he not bright enough to work out from context that this was the expedition that would definitely be the end of Pallas, or did he not fully believe his own (prophetic, truthful) mother, or did he (thanks to encroaching senility?) have an imperfect memory? Then again at 1.531ff. Carmentis ends her speech with a flurry of predictions about the succession of Augustus' line, Tiberius' principate and Livia's adoption into the Julian family and deification, thus moving down in time far further than any of the prophetic passages in the *Aeneid* (and, of course, in view of his death in 19 BC Virgil could not possibly have included such material). This makes Ovid's Carmentis seem even more impressive than she was in Virgil, and also it looks to me as if Ovid is ribbing and surpassing the *Aeneid*'s manifestly fabricated prophecies concerning Augustus.

---

[59] See pp. 34f.

[60] Apollo is presumably the god who stimulates her predictions at 1.474.

[61] Cf. p. 35.

At 3.545ff. another type of episode occurs—the sequel. This passage is given an epic flavour by its length and many Virgilian characters, details and themes, but it is really mock-epic, an elegiac and largely female-centered sequel to the *Aeneid* which has a quite different tone to it (witty from the start, it constantly sparkles and amuses with its intertextual ingenuity). The sequel is also entertaining as a story *per se*, in view of its action, drama, changes of fortune and unexpected developments in plot.[63] It picks up the tales of several figures, four in particular.

Most obviously there is a continuation of the story of Anna. She had been abruptly dropped by Virgil (because she was a minor character and his focus was on Aeneas); here she is reintroduced, given a new importance and brought back into the ambit of the hero. There are various links with the *Aeneid* to ensure that the progression from it is credible and not too harsh. The opening lines in Ovid smoothly take up Dido's death at the end of Virgil's fourth book with the gathering of her ashes and with her tomb and epitaph; and even when the narrative then moves off in a whole new direction, events like the invasion of Carthage, the threat of Pygmalion and Aeneas' hospitality are still tied in with the Virgilian background.[64] That new direction (with various vicissitudes) at 3.551ff. makes for interest and independence, giving Anna surprising and exciting adventures, and making her the star of her own mini-*Aeneid* (with various twists, as already noted). After initial setbacks Anna's fortunes rise, completely inverting the fall in the epic.[65] In addition, Ovid actually manages to dwarf *Aeneid* 4, from Anna's point of view: her sister's death was a tragedy, but here Anna is invaded, flees, nearly loses her life three times, enters on a union with a god and acquires divine status herself, so that the occurrences in *Aeneid* 4, with a brand new take, can be viewed as mere preamble to even more momentous happenings.

---

[62] On which see HINDS 1998 99ff. and EDMUNDS 159ff.

[63] These experiences of Anna are found elsewhere only at Sil. It. 8.50ff., and in the light of the extensive Virgilian basis it seems probable that this account in the *Fasti* was largely or even totally Ovid's own invention.

We learn more about Aeneas' later life too (at 3.601ff.), and again a figure in the sequel is carefully tied in with his epic past. He is still dutiful, caring, grateful to Dido for her hospitality[66] and sad and incredulous over the queen's suicide. With rather more point, when he rouses his wife's suspicions by sending Anna gifts and revealing his former association with her in his efforts to get her accepted, it is clear that he still experiences problems with the female sex (especially in convincing them of his good intentions).[67] But there are developments too. Now Aeneas is at peace, settled in Latium, king of the merged Trojans and Latins, and married to Lavinia.[68] But his marriage is not without its troubles, as we have seen. And, after all his great exploits, for Aeneas this encounter with Anna is a rather demeaning non-adventure in which his attempt to return hospitality like a true hero ultimately fails and his position as a leader is called into question

---

[64] Cf. the danger from Carthage's neighbours at *Aen.* 1.339, 564, 4.320f. and the resentment of Iarbas at *Aen.* 4.198ff., 326 (with an imaginative touch Ovid has him finally make it into Dido's bedroom at *F.* 3.553f.); cf. the fears about Pygmalion at *Aen.* 4.44, 325f.; cf. Aeneas' gratitide to Dido at *Aen.* 1.595ff. and his friendship with Anna at *Aen.* 4.421f.

[65] For the very different final pictures of Anna in Virgil and Ovid see p. 126.

[66] Although at 3.623 he is rather less effusive than he was at *Aen.* 1.595ff., and at 3.629ff. he excises Dido.

[67] Cf. his delay over telling Dido about his departure, so that he could find a time to break it gently to her, and her reaction (*Aen.* 4.291ff., 305ff.). Presents cause trouble here as they did at *Aen.* 1.709ff.

[68] As was prefigured at *Aen.* 12.791ff.

(even his own wife disobeys him). Ovid also contrives to undermine the end of the *Aeneid*. For after we have read this passage in the *Fasti* our final picture of Aeneas is no longer the triumphant (if disturbing) warrior boiling with rage at *Aen.* 12.945ff., but an embarrassed and ineffectual husband glossing over a former affair and appealing to his jealous wife to love an apparent rival for his affections.

This is also a sequel to the story of Lavinia, who undergoes an even more drastic metamorphosis at 3.633ff. From being prospectively a wife in the *Aeneid*, she is now actually a wife.[69] More significantly, from being a nice girl, something of a nonentity, who did virtually nothing, she has now become a woman so disturbed by suspicion and jealousy that she is capable of murder, and she now plays a more active role and is important for the plot. In her final appearance in the *Aeneid* (12.605f.) she was lamenting, frenzied (*furit*) with grief at her mother's self-inflicted death; here she hates with a frenzy (*furialiter*, 3.637), and plots the death of another and then her own death.

Finally, there is more on Dido, in the most unexpected resumption of all. At *Aen.* 6.450ff. she was surprisingly brought back into the epic, but then seemed to have gone for ever; at *F.* 3.639ff. she is brought back one more time, as Ovid takes up that incident in the Underworld. She is still a blood-stained ghost, but now instead of being hard to recognise[70] she is quite distinct; no longer hostile and silent, she is here friendly and speaks; this time she does not flee, but tells Anna to flee; and instead of rejoining her husband Sychaeus, she appears in a vision as Sychaeus had done to her[71] and sends Anna off to eventually join her own new mate.

The last kind of episode to be considered in this section is the prequel. The account of Evander's coming to Latium at 1.469ff. acts as a straightforward prequel to his presence there in Virgil *Aeneid* 8, expanding on 8.333ff. in particular, as we have seen. Ovid's lines on Juturna at 2.585ff. (quoted and translated on pp. 76f.) provide a prequel to her appearance in *Aeneid* 12, but in this case we find something rather more amusing and much more intricate.

---

[69] *Lavinia coniunx* at *Aen.* 7.314, 12.17, 80, 937 and *F.* 3.629. It also turns out, unfortunately, that Lavinia, with her passionate frenzy, is one of those women who take after their mother (cf. MCKEOWN 1984 171f., BARCHIESI 1997 166).

[70] *Aen.* 6.452ff.

[71] *Aen.* 1.353ff.

Providing a comic background for the grim events of *Aen.* 12 and elaborating on the allusion there to Jupiter's rape of Juturna in particular (at 12.141ff., 878f.), Ovid places Virgil's tragic nymph in a situation that has a distinctly humorous side (as she frustrates and humiliates the amorous Jupiter by hiding from him in woods and water and reduces him to begging her sister nymphs for assistance). We also see a rather different Jupiter from the august and dominant figure of the final book of the *Aeneid*: instead of making solemn speeches of great moment to Juno (12.793ff., 830ff.), he here wheedles some minor goddesses, so they will help him perpetrate a sexual assault; and the all-powerful king of the gods who imposes his will (e.g. 12.806) here somehow cannot catch a fleeing nymph. There is also a pawky touch in some more retroactive intertextuality. After reading these lines with their rather bizarre anticipations (sort of pre-echoes) of incidents in Virgil, many will be distracted when re-reading the fight in *Aeneid* 12 and find its seriousness subverted somewhat: Juturna helping Turnus to escape a male pursuer (intent on slaying him) now calls to mind Juturna herself escaping a male pursuer (intent on having sex with her); divine help for Turnus' pursuer (so that he can kill Turnus) recalls the nymphs' promise of help for Juturna's pursuer (so that he can rape her); and when Juturna hides herself in a river in grief at Turnus' coming death (12.886) one is reminded of her hiding in water to evade the lustful Jupiter.[72]

This prequel also functions as a learned gloss, explaining certain things in Virgil. At *Aen.* 12.142ff. Juno addressed Juturna as someone who was very dear to her and was her favourite among all Latin females bedded by Jupiter, and then appealed to the nymph to help Turnus in his combat with Aeneas (which, of course, she did). Thanks to Ovid we can now see why Juno was so fond of Juturna (because she eluded Jupiter and made a fool of him for a long time) and one of the reasons why Juno asked Juturna to act in opposition to the will of Jupiter[73] (because she had done so before, and with success), and we can now see an additional motive for Juturna helping Turnus when he was tracked repeatedly on the battlefield and chased in the actual duel by Aeneas[74] (apart from the fact that he was her brother, she had been tracked repeatedly and chased herself).

---

[72] For more on the humour here see pp. 89ff. Cf. also Ovid's correction of Virgil discussed on p. 109.

[73] Cf. e.g. *Aen.* 12.793ff.

[74] At *Aen.* 12.468ff., 783ff.

A further complication is only revealed late on in the narrative. With a typical tease Ovid here does not give us the prequel that we are led to expect. One naturally assumes that Ovid will tell the full story of Jupiter's rape of Juturna, especially when he seems to set that up at 2.591–8 (where all her sister nymphs agree to help Jupiter by stopping Juturna from hiding in the river). However, at 599ff. one of them (Lara) foils the assault by warning the victim; at this point Juturna is suddenly abandoned and Ovid concentrates instead on Lara's punishment, as her tongue is ripped out and she is taken to the Underworld by Mercury (who rapes her on the way, despite her mute plea for mercy). So we don't get the full prequel (including the rape of Juturna), only part of it (or a prequel to the prequel). And what we do get on Juturna is in fact only a preamble to the silencing of and attack on Lara, only a component of another story (in which the rape of Lara by a determined god foreshadows the eventual rape of Juturna by another determined god). Actually, more than that, when Lara enters the narrative there seems to be sombre prefiguring of Turnus' death: here too Juturna drops out of the story, and a sibling[75] of hers is subjected to violence, makes a futile appeal to a more powerful character and goes down to the Underworld.

Techniques in Combination

For the purposes of analysis it has been helpful to study the main techniques in isolation, but, as will have become clear especially from the comments in several sections[76] on 1.469ff. (Carmentis and Evander) and 3.545ff. (Anna), often several modes of allusion are employed simultaneously. This section will investigate two linked passages which exhibit dense combination of techniques and which, particularly in conjunction, amount to something of an intertextual tour-de-force.

At 1.363ff. Ovid presents his own version of the story of Aristaeus' meeting with Proteus that Virgil had recounted at *Georgics* 4.317ff.:

---

[75] The relationship is spelled out in 2.603 with *Iuturnae . . . sororis* 'her sister Juturna' (cf. *Iuturna soror* at *Aen.* 12.222).

[76] On *oppositio in imitando* and *variatio*; polemical engagement; simultaneous Virgilian allusion; *contaminatio*; interfigurality; and episodes.

> flebat Aristaeus, quod apes cum stirpe necatas
> viderat inceptos destituisse favos;
> caerula quem genetrix aegre solata dolentem
> addidit haec dictis ultima verba suis:
> 'siste, puer, lacrimas: Proteus tua damna levabit
> quoque modo repares quae periere dabit.
> decipiat ne te versis tamen ille figuris,
> impediant geminas vincula firma manus.'
> pervenit ad vatem iuvenis, resolutaque somno
> alligat aequorei bracchia capta senis.
> ille sua faciem transformis adulterat arte;
> mox domitus vinclis in sua membra redit,
> oraque caerulea tollens rorantia barba
> 'qua' dixit 'repares arte requiris apes?
> obrue mactati corpus tellure iuvenci:
> quod petis a nobis, obrutus ille dabit.'
> iussa facit pastor; fervent examina putri
> de bove: mille animas una necata dedit.

> Aristaeus wept because he saw that his bees had died (progeny and all) and had abandoned the honeycombs which they had begun. His azure mother soothed his grief with difficulty and concluded with these final words: 'Stop crying, my boy. Proteus will remedy your losses and tell you how to recover what has perished. But, so that he cannot elude you by changing his shape, bind both his hands with stout chains.' The youth went to the seer and seized and bound the arms of the old man of the sea when they were relaxed in sleep. Transformed by his art/trickery, he changed his appearance; soon, mastered by the chains, he returned to his own form and, raising his dripping face with its blue beard, he said: 'Are you asking what technique you can use to restore your bees? Sacrifice a bullock and bury its body in the ground: when buried it will give you what you seek from me.' The shepherd carried out his orders; swarms came boiling out of the putrefied bull: the killing of a single soul created a thousand souls.

Several salient features have already been noted in this chapter,[77] and the tricking of the reader is discussed elsewhere.[78] But in the very process of trying to deceive readers Ovid also works in some subtle foreshadowing at the start. The alteration of mood there (to more poignancy) prefigures the alteration of mood (to humour) in connection with Proteus' speech. Ovid's modification of minor details (like describing Cyrene as *caerula* 'azure' and making her tell Aristaeus to stop crying) anticipates his subsequent modification of Proteus.[79] His initial condensation of Virgil and deletion of various elements (like Aristaeus' speech to his mother) precede his later curtailment of the episode and exclusion of the lines on Orpheus and Eurydice. In addition, there seems in retrospect to be an instance of parody which also foreshadows (the comic twist when Proteus speaks): whereas at *G.* 4.315f. Virgil introduced his narrative with a solemn interrogatory address to the Muses, at 1.362 Ovid ushers in his by directing a question to bulls and sheep.

---

[77] See pp. 109f., 126.
[78] See pp. 227f.

There is *variatio* and *oppositio in imitando* too. Ovid completely reverses the Virgilian arrangement whereby light-hearted aspects at the start are succeeded by pathos in Proteus' speech. At *G.* 4.317 Virgil opens with *pastor Aristaeus* 'the shepherd Aristaeus', but Ovid only refers to Aristaeus as a *pastor* at the end (1.379).[80] Virgil's passage was a lengthy aetiological insert at the conclusion of the final book of his didactic poem and constituted a striking climax to the whole work. Ovid (as well as adjusting the *aetion*) makes his passage anything but a climax: he includes it half-way through his first book, within a long section on sacrifice, keeps it short and undramatic, and after only 12 lines moves on to the more extensive and in several ways more memorable anecdote of Priapus' attempt to rape Lotis. Unlike Virgil Ovid also plays down the divine and sacrificial elements (in the midst of discussion of sacrifices to the gods!): he says nothing about Aristaeus' loss being a punishment by the nymphs, and he has him sacrifice only one bullock, in contrast to the Virgilian offerings of four bulls, four heifers, a sheep, a calf and poppies.[81]

Contaminatio is also in evidence. There may be a particularly tricky touch in *caerula . . . genetrix* ('azure mother') applied to Cyrene in 1.365. That phrase does not appear before here in extant Latin, but *caerula mater* (with the same meaning) does, at Hor. *Epod.* 13.16 and Prop. 2.9.15 (in both cases of Thetis). If Ovid's expression is a deliberate variant on Horace and Propertius, then as well as including allusion to those two authors Ovid may be referring very obliquely to Virgil's likening of his Cyrene to Thetis in Homer's *Iliad*.[82] More definite is the 'looking through', the simultaneous echoing of both Virgil and his model—Homer *Odyssey* 4.354ff.[83] There Menelaus was helped by Eidothea (daughter of Proteus), who advised him to capture the god and ask him why he was stranded on his way home from Troy; he did so, and in answer to his question was told briefly that he had failed to make offerings to the gods and must rectify that omission, and then (after further questioning) was told at length about the returns of the other Greeks; after that he made the offerings and was given a fair wind. Looking through to Homer, Ovid makes variations on Virgil (who had made variations on Homer). Whereas Virgil called Proteus just *senex* 'old man', Ovid in 1.372 uses *aequoreus senex* ('old man of the sea'), which is a direct translation of *geron halios*, applied by Homer several times to his Proteus.[84] Virgil dropped the short initial speech by Homer's Proteus but kept his long mythical narrative (on the heroes' homecomings); by way of contrast Ovid drops the latter and restores the brief speech answering the question and recommending sacrifice (although typically he abbreviates Homer's nine lines to three). Also unlike Virgil but like Homer, Ovid keeps the helping goddess out of things after Proteus has finished speaking[85] and has his protagonist follow the advice given him by Proteus and see his problems promptly solved.

---

[79] In particular (in contrast to Virgil's Cyrene) at 1.367f. Aristaeus' mother says specifically that Proteus will tell him how to restore his bees (with no mention of him explaining the cause of their death), and that is exactly what happens at 1.377f. with Ovid's Proteus (unlike Virgil's seer).

[80] Ovid's opening (*flebat Aristaeus* 'Aristaeus wept') stresses *flebat* (in place of *pastor*) as part of the more mournful aura in his start.

[81] The reduction of Virgil's victims parallels the reduction of his lines.

There is an interfigural aspect too. When he speaks at 1.376ff. Ovid's Proteus suddenly becomes the accomodating god of *Odyssey* 4, as well as taking over the role of Virgil's Cyrene as advisor. Such modification of Proteus is, of course, all very appropriate for the famous shape-shifter. In addition, his change back to his original form at 1.374 now has new point, since it (together with the Homeric designation of him as the old man of the sea in 1.372) neatly prefigures his reversion to the original (helpful) Proteus of Homer shortly afterwards.

Two books later Ovid surprisingly revisits the encounter with Proteus a little way into a narrative about Numa (inspired by his wife Egeria) to explain why the Salii carry sacred shields and sing of Mamurius. After Numa gave the Romans laws and made them piously observe rites, Jupiter sent a dense rain of thunderbolts, terrifying the king and his people. At this point (3.289ff.) Egeria stepped in to help her husband:

---

[82] On which see e.g. WILKINSON 213f.

[83] On such simultaneous allusion see MCKEOWN 1987 37ff. and compare FARRELL 163ff.

[84] *Od.* 4.349, 365, 384, 401 and 542.

[85] Unlike Eidothea, Virgil's Cyrene steps in again and speaks, giving Aristaeus the advice that his Proteus withheld. Ovid may be underlining the elision of this additional speech for her in contradistinction to Virgil with *ultima verba* 'final words' in 1.366 (in the Ovidian account this WAS the last thing that she said).

cui dea 'ne nimium terrere: piabile fulmen
  est' ait 'et saevi flectitur ira Iovis. 290
sed poterunt ritum Picus Faunusque piandi
  tradere, Romani numen utrumque soli.
nec sine vi tradent: adhibe tu vincula captis';
  atque ita qua possint edidit arte capi.
lucus Aventino suberat niger ilicis umbra, 295
  quo posses viso dicere 'numen inest'.
in medio gramen, muscoque adoperta virenti
  manabat saxo vena perennis aquae;
inde fere soli Faunus Picusque bibebant:
  huc venit et fonti rex Numa mactat ovem, 300
plenaque odorati disponit pocula Bacchi,
  cumque suis antro conditus ipse latet.
ad solitos veniunt silvestria numina fontes
  et relevant multo pectora sicca mero.
vina quies sequitur: gelido Numa prodit ab antro 305
  vinclaque sopitas addit in arta manus.
somnus ut abscessit, pugnando vincula temptant
  rumpere; pugnantes fortius illa tenent.
tum Numa: 'di nemorum, factis ignoscite nostris
  si scelus ingenio scitis abesse meo, 310
quoque modo possit fulmen monstrate piari.'
  sic Numa; sic quatiens cornua Faunus ait:
'magna petis, nec quae monitu tibi discere nostro
  fas sit: habent fines numina nostra suos.
di sumus agrestes et qui dominemur in altis 315
  montibus; arbitrium est in sua tecta Iovi.
hunc tu non poteris per te deducere caelo,
  at poteris nostra forsitan usus ope.'
dixerat haec Faunus; par est sententia Pici.
  'deme tamen nobis vincula', Picus ait, 320
'Iuppiter huc veniet, valida perductus ab arte:
  nubila promissi Styx mihi testis erit.'
emissi laqueis quid agant, quae carmina dicant,
  quaque trahant superis sedibus arte Iovem
scire nefas homini. nobis concessa canentur 325
  quaeque pio dici vatis ab ore licet.

The goddess said to him: 'Don't be unduly afraid: the thunderbolt can be averted by atonement, and the anger of fierce Jupiter is prevailed

> upon to relent. But Picus and Faunus (both of them deities of Roman soil) will be able to tell you the ritual for averting it. But they won't tell without force: catch them and put them in bonds.' And then she disclosed the trick by which they could be caught. At the foot of the Aventine there was a grove black with the shade of holm-oaks; at the sight of it you would have said, 'There is a deity there.' In the middle there was grass and, covered by green moss, a stream of never-failing water flowed from a rock. Faunus and Picus often drank from it on their own. King Numa went there and sacrificed a sheep to the spring; he set out drinking-cups full of fragrant wine and hid out of sight with his men in a cave. The woodland deities came to their usual spring and refreshed their dry throats with lots of wine. Sleep followed on from the wine. Numa emerged from the cold cave and put the sleepers' hands into tight bonds. When sleep left them, they tried to break the bonds by struggling, but they held them more firmly when they struggled. Then Numa [said]: 'Gods of the groves, pardon what I have done, since you know that there is no evil in my mind, and show me how the thunderbolt can be averted by atonement.' So Numa. Faunus, shaking his horns, spoke so: 'You are asking for a great thing, the kind of thing that it is not permissible for you to learn through advice from us: our divine power has its limits. We are country gods who have dominion on high mountains; control over his own home belongs to Jupiter. You will not be able to draw him down from heaven by your own means, but you will perhaps be able to if you make use of our assistance.' That's what Faunus said. Picus' opinion was the same. 'But take the bonds off us,' said Picus, 'Jupiter will come here, drawn by a powerful technique/trick: the dark Styx will witness my promise.' What they did when they were freed from the ropes, what spells they spoke, and with what a technique/trick they hauled Jupiter from his celestial abode it is not right for a mortal to know. Things that are permitted will be the subject of my poetry, the kind of things that can be spoken of by a poet with devout lips.

This time the reprise, signposted by the Virgilian reminiscence at 3.288,[86] takes the form of a mirror image. Aristaeus' encounter with Proteus in *G.* 4.317ff. is clearly reflected here. In addition to several verbal correspondences[87] the whole sequence of events is very similar: a troubled male (upset by divine activity) who is related to a water nymph is directed by her for help to the haunt of some gods and instructed by her on how to capture the deities; he hides in a cave, catches the gods while they sleep and binds them; they cannot escape, and when they struggle their bonds are tightened;[88] in the end they speak in response to a request by the protagonist. But there are also many twists to Virgil. For the present we may note that the Ovidian passage is not in itself an explanation of the origin of anything, but a (non-climactic) preamble to an *aetion*. At *Fasti* 3.290 the helping goddess (a wife rather than a mother, and not as prominent as Virgil's Cyrene) speaks of divine anger at the start (Cyrene mentioned the angry nymphs after Proteus' speech).[89] In Ovid the protagonist sacrifices a sheep before (not after) capturing and interrogating his gods, and when they get free from their bonds (unlike Proteus) they stay and offer real help. They do not come out with a lengthy mythological narrative, but again there is some sort of ellipse (whereas Proteus did not give specific explanation or advice, this time at 3.323ff. Ovid withholds information, about the drawing down of Jupiter, and in so doing ends his account with a joke).

---

[86] See p. 102.

[87] E.g. for *F.* 3.293 *nec sine vi tradent: adhibe tu vincula captis* cf. *G.* 4.398 *nam sine vi non ulla dabit praecepta* and 4.399f. *vincula capto/ tende*; for *F.* 3.300 *mactat ovem* cf. *G.* 4.546 *mactabis ovem*; and for *F.* 3.301 *plenaque odorati disponit pocula Bacchi* cf. *G.* 4.378f. *plena reponunt/ pocula.* On allusion to Aristaeus here cf. also HERBERT-BROWN 2002 182ff.

On top of all that, there is *contaminatio*, as Ovid also works in allusion to Virgil's own model.[90] In common with *Odyssey* 4.354ff. (and in contrast to *G.* 4.317ff.) Ovid's passage is not a free-standing narrative insert but just part of a longer narrative; his protagonist is a king and has companions with him when he tackles his divine victims; his helping nymph drops out of the story after setting up the ambush; he is told to set the gods free from their bonds after their struggles prove futile, and he gets the kind of assistance that he wants from his divinities (who are not angry).[91]

---

[88] At *F.* 3.308. Cf. *G.* 4.412.

[89] There may be similar inversion (and variation) at *F.* 3.277ff., where war, lawgiving, thunderbolts and heaven figure early on (compare *G.* 4.560–2 after the Aristaeus narrative).

[90] Noted, but not explored, by BOYLE-WOODARD 214. And there is not just Homeric reminiscence. Ovid's line 295 is very close to Tibullus 2.5.27 and Virg. *G.* 3.333f. Other echoes from elsewhere in Virgil are possible in 3.301 (*odoratus Bacchus* is found before here only at *G.* 4.279), 3.324 (*superis sedibus* may come from *Aen.* 11.532, although the phrase also appears in line 282 of Cic. *Arat.* frag. 34) and 3.326 (the only earlier instance of *pius* applied to *os* is at *Aen.* 6.530). It is also possible that in this passage Ovid had an eye to the story of king Midas getting the country god Silenus drunk and making him fall asleep by mixing wine with the water of a spring (on which see FRAZER III 88f.).

[91] So there is also conflation of character here. Proteus (with a further shift for the shape-shifter) is subsumed in both Picus and Faunus (Roman gods of the land); while Egeria blends the two Greek water nymphs Cyrene and Eidothea; and Numa (peaceful and pious lawgiver) contains elements of Aristaeus (a semi-divine benefactor of men but also a failed rapist) and Menelaus (a king, but a warlike one, with a very different kind of wife).

At the same time one cannot but think also of Ovid's earlier version of the Aristaeus tale, not that far back at *F.* 1.363ff.[92] It seems that Ovid here set himself a real test of brilliance—to recall but also to ring the changes on and top Virgil, Homer and himself. Various differences from the Virgilian passage have already been mentioned, but there are many turns to all three preceding accounts simultaneously. This time the narrative is totally Romanized and actually inspired by a character who figures in it. Here Ovid drops the transformations by the divine prey, and adds the comic touch of the gods falling for the obvious trick of the wine and drinking so much of it that they pass out.[93] Numa also outdoes Aristaeus and Menelaus by catching two deities, and his (*very* helpful) gods remarkably bring down Jupiter from heaven; and while his predecessors only spoke with a minor divinity, Numa proceeds from that to a (memorable) conversation with the king of heaven himself (at 3.333ff.).[94] And this reprise of prior reprises, with its threefold *variatio* and *aemulatio*, is just an early part of a lengthy narrative that goes on to entertain in many more ways.

---

[92] As well as extensive parallels in details, events and order of events there are several words in common (with 1.370–2 echoed in particular)—*vinc(u)la* (1.370, 3.293, 306), *capio* (1.372, 3.293, 294), *(per)venio* (1.371, 3.300), bound *manus* (1.370, 3.306), divine *somnus* (1.371, 3.307) and *ars* relayed by gods (1.376, 3.321).

[93] The humour is especially felt after the solemnity of 3.295–8 (cf. FOX 203).

[94] Ovid seems to be playing with the idea of Egeria (an inspirer with her own agenda: see pp. 39f.) making her husband outshine Aristaeus and Menelaus, and Egeria (Ovid's own creation and a figure in his own poem) capping his account at 1.363ff. It is also possible that Numa besting Faunus and Picus and (at 3.333ff.) Jupiter himself is meant to be viewed as an irreverent analogue for Ovid besting Virgil and Homer and Ovid himself.

CHAPTER FIVE

CHARACTERS

Although characters are, of course, an inevitable and vital component of a narrative,[1] Ovid's use of them in the *Fasti* has not received much attention.[2] This is a pity because he does interesting and effective things with them. For instance, he utilizes them (mainly mortals and gods)[3] to build up a generally genial and light-hearted mythical world, not a bland one, but one decidedly less dark and disturbing than the worlds of the *Metamorphoses* and the *Aeneid*: bad things are done to and by people in the *Fasti*, but there is not much dwelling on that, and there is little extreme suffering, brutality or horror; divinities can be thugs certainly but tend overall to be beneficent rather than maleficent, are often figures of fun, and even the hostile ones are seldom especially cruel; among humans there are many more sympathetic individuals than villains, and most of the latter are not textually prominent and do not prevail.[4] Ovid also makes learned play with interfigurality[5] and goes in for internal characterization (whereby intriguingly and amusingly the narrators and inspirers within the poem are the ones who characterize themselves and others).[6] However, the most striking features of Ovid's employment of characters, and the real keynotes, are economy, cleverness and versatility.

---

[1] On characterization see especially HARVEY, FORSTER 51–89, CHATMAN 107–138, RIMMON-KENAN 29–42, 59–70, BAL 23–37, 79–93, GREIMAS 1987 106–120, TOOLAN 90–145, PELLING, GALEF, ABBOTT 123ff. and *New Literary History* 5,2 (1974), an issue devoted to changing views of character. Analysis of this feature of narrative is not as developed as it might be, and I have had to branch out into areas of investigation neglected by these critics (a new or rare prominence for characters, recurring figures, and deliberate minimization and elision).

[2] Lucretia has attracted the most notice: see e.g. HEINZE 344ff., LEE and FOX 212ff.

[3] Animals of various sorts figure quite often (e.g. the ass, dolphin, raven, fish and kite at 1.433f., 2.113f., 249ff., 459ff., 3.808), there are occasionally monsters (e.g. at 1.550ff., 3.799ff., 6.131ff.), and in one case there is an inanimate character (the Tiber's water at 3.52 is personified and plays an important role).

[4] Naturally, as many of the narratives concern early Rome, there is fighting and killing, but there is not as much death as one might expect and as one finds in the *Aeneid* and *Metamorphoses*, and the worst things that are done to and by people are generally (except for Tullia at 6.587ff.) downplayed or offset (the maltreatment of Callisto at 2.155ff. is not as lengthy or severe as that at *Met.* 2.409ff.; the mutilation and rape of Lara at 2.607ff. is brief; Lucretia is avenged at 2.837ff.; Ino is finally deified at 6.550). I count 26 kindly deities as opposed to 16 hostile and predatory ones in the poem, humour is often found in connection with the latter, and the only genuine savagery appears at 2.155ff., 607ff. and 6.485ff. Among humans the only real villains who are highlighted and who prevail are Tarquinius Superbus

Economy

In the *Fasti* Ovid chooses to keep most of the mythical and legendary narratives short, and economy in connection with characterization is part of this streamlining process. The vast majority of the stories are not character-driven, and Ovid is clearly more interested in other aspects, such as humour, action and *doctrina* (learning) to illustrate and enliven. Since he employs his characters especially as narrative devices (to provide texture and colour, to advance the plot and so on), he seldom develops them much as personalities and generally opts for the stark and simple rather than the complex kind of character (i.e. a rounded and multi-faceted figure, with two or more dominant traits, and with still more traits in the background).

With the shorter narratives Ovid normally restricts the number of main (i.e. prominent) characters or groups of characters in each to just one, two or three, thereby saving space (and also avoiding clutter and ensuring a tight focus). He relies in many cases on our knowledge of these personages from myth and earlier literature, and he greatly favours indirect characterization, thriftily putting the onus on the reader to make inferences about their nature from significant actions (in particular) and speech by them. When he does turn to direct characterization (overtly informing us that people are, for example, brave, rather than just showing us them being brave), usually he goes for a few bold strokes, leaving us to fill in the rest for ourselves, and highlights aspects pertinent to his tale. In almost all of these cases characters receive only one, two or three epithets; exceptions

---

and Sextus at 2.687ff. (but they are subsequently banished) and Tullia at 6.587ff. There are also a few conspicuous monsters (Cacus and the screech-owls at 1.550ff. and 6.131ff.), but they are defeated. On the mythical and legendary world of the *Fasti* see further pp. 172f.

[5] See pp. 119ff.

[6] See pp. 32ff.

are thereby highlighted and include Mezentius at 4.881f. (who is described as famous, fierce, a great fighter on horseback, and an even better fighter on foot) and Sextus (see pp. 163ff.). Actual descriptive pauses (suspending the action for direct characterization) are very rare (and so emphatic)—Cacus at 1.550ff. and the screech-owls at 6.131ff.[7]

Sparingly Ovid goes for the partial picture, instead of telling us a great deal about his creations. In this connection he sometimes employs adept synecdoche, giving us the most important aspects, which amount to the essence of the figures (e.g. Arion the marvellous musician at 2.83ff.), or including a telling speech or action that sums up the whole character (e.g. Tarquinius Superbus beheading the tallest lilies in his garden as a sign that the leading men of Gabii should be executed).[8] Many other aspects are ignored to a greater or lesser extent. Only at 2.183 and 3.59 is Ovid specific about age. With regard to background, apart from passing remarks about parentage, he does not build up a picture by telling us about a person's early years, family and friends, shaping influences etc. He seldom includes information about environment (e.g. possessions, companions, home), unless it has particular relevance or impact (like Hyrieus' simple household at 5.495ff. and Cacus' horrific cave at 1.555ff.). Physical description is also uncommon (normally at most there is the odd epithet or a general allusion to beauty), except when it has particular point (as with Lucretia's attractions at 2.763ff.); and status and rank are conveyed succinctly, if quite frequently. Ovid concentrates instead on elements which bring the characters alive briefly and economically—their intellectual capacity, their moral qualities and failings (especially emotive ones like love, courage, savagery, arrogance and cowardice), and their thoughts and feelings (particularly strong ones like terror, misery and lust), as conveyed by their words and deeds, which sometimes give us a distinct insight into the inner person (as with Sextus and Tullia).[9]

---

[7] Cf. also Claudia Quinta at 4.305ff.

[8] Cf. also Sextus undergoing a flogging at 2.696, Amulius ordering the death of Romulus and Remus at 2.385 and 3.51, and Tullia's speech at 6.589ff.

[9] As a result of this streamlining all of the characters are static (i.e. their personality does not develop but remains the same at the end as it was at the start), except for Brutus at 2.711ff. and (over the course of two adjoining passages) Cranae at 6.105ff. and 131ff.

New/Rare Prominence

On several occasions Ovid gives characters a prominence which was new or at least rare as far as we can tell from surviving literature.[10] As well as providing a surprising twist and an enlivening focus for old stories, this process often involves ingenuity and complexity. A particularly effective and clever example occurs at 5.381ff., where uniquely in extant versions of Chiron's death his pupil Achilles is present and prominent (and intriguingly Hercules and Achilles are brought together, two of the greatest heroes ever, with a Trojan connection adumbrated in 5.389).[11] There we are told that when Chiron was tutoring Achilles (busying the hands that would slay Hector with strumming the lyre), Hercules turned up at his cave and was hospitably received; Achilles could not keep his hands off Hercules' lion skin, and Chiron was inspecting his poisoned arrows when he dropped one of them on his foot, piercing it; Hercules and Achilles groaned at this, and all Chiron's medical skill was useless against the venom. The end is dominated by Achilles:

> stabat, ut ante patrem, lacrimis perfusus Achilles:
>   sic flendus Peleus, si moreretur, erat.
> saepe manus aegras manibus fingebat amicis:
>   morum, quos fecit, praemia doctor habet. 410
> oscula saepe dedit, dixit quoque saepe iacenti
>   'vive, precor, nec me, care, relinque, pater.'
> nona dies aderat, cum tu, iustissime Chiron,
>   bis septem stellis corpora cinctus eras.

> Achilles stood drenched with tears, as if before his father; he would have wept like that for Peleus, if he was dying. He often caressed [Chiron's] ailing hands with his loving hands, and his teacher was rewarded for moulding his character like that. Achilles often kissed him and often said to him as he lay there; 'Live, please; don't leave me, dear father.' The ninth day had come, Chiron, you paragon of justice, when your body was outlined by fourteen stars.

---

[10] E.g. at 1.469ff. with Carmentis (cf. pp. 34f., 123f. and 128), at 2.383ff. with the servants carrying the infants Romulus and Remus (see pp. 159ff.), at 3.545ff. with Anna (cf. pp. 124f., 129f.) and at 5.451ff. with Remus (see pp. 54f.) in addition to the two examples discussed in my main text.

[11] There does not seem to be any parallel for their meeting, but at *Arg.* 1.553ff. Apollonius Rhodius has the child Achilles shown to Peleus on the Argo (when Hercules is also aboard), and it is possible that Ovid is picking up and improving on that conjunction here.

A tale that is sad in itself is made still sadder by the presence of Achilles, who reinforces Hercules' groan at 400 and then takes the grief much further at 407ff. It is tragic for a child to witness someone's death, even more so when that person is a loved teacher and father-figure and dies slowly and irrevocably. And Ovid catches Achilles' misery in detail and at length, highlighting his tears, his great closeness to Chiron, his need to touch him and his desperation (hence the repeated *saepe* 'often' and his animated but futile appeal in 412).

At the same time there is adroit foreshadowing. Scholars have already pointed out how Ovid prefigures the death of Achilles due to a wound in the foot by an arrow (and also the passing of Hercules due to a similar poison), and the tearful and moaning Achilles' distress over the death of Patroclus, and his meeting with Priam at Homer *Iliad* 24.507ff. (where he thinks of his father, touches old Priam's hands, weeps and groans).[12] It also seems likely that there is anticipation here of Achilles' deep sorrow over the loss of his dear Briseis as well.[13] We see too the incipient warrior in Achilles, attracted to Hercules' lion skin (the spoil of one of his Labours, worn by him as armour) and boldly touching it. So too within the passage itself the reference in 5.385 and 389 to his killing of Hector and other Trojans clearly points the way to the coming demise of Chiron. In addition there is extensive irony and inversion. Achilles' man-slaying hands[14] here touch Chiron with tender affection, and this hero who will cause so much grief by inflicting death[15] is here himself grieving over death. Achilles begs his tutor not to die, the same Achilles who will send so many men to their death without pity and who will demand the sacrifice of Polyxena.[16] In particular (especially after the allusion to the slaying of Hector in 5.385), when Achilles stands over the beloved but fatally wounded Chiron where he lies and tells him to live, we may be meant to think of him (after he has fatally wounded his hated enemy in their duel) standing over Hector where he lies and telling him to die at *Iliad* 22.365.

At 3.179ff. Mars relates how the war between the Romans and their neighbours over the Rape of the Sabine Women was finally brought to an end when on the advice of his daughter-in-law the abducted women came between the two armies with their babies in their arms. It would appear that this is the only account in which Romulus' wife is represented as the one behind this ploy (conceiving of it and in complete control of its implementation)[17] and is given textual prominence.[18] That makes for intricacy and an entertainingly tart and provocative flavour.

---

[12] See NEWLANDS 118, BROOKES 447ff.

[13] Cf. e.g. Homer *Il.* 1.348ff., 9.336, 18.442ff.

[14] See 5.385, Homer *Il.* 24.479 etc.

[15] Cf. e.g. Homer *Il.* 22.421ff., Catull. 64.421ff.

[16] See Homer *Il.* 21.224ff., Catull. 64.357ff., 363ff., Ovid *Met.* 13.441ff. etc.

This featuring of Romulus' spouse facilitates much contrast and correspondence. For example, Mars' pride in his son at 3.183ff. is matched by his pride in his daughter-in-law at 3.206ff. The god's speech to Romulus recommending the forceful rape of the Sabines at 3.198 is picked up by her speech to the women with its pacific advice at 3.207ff. Also Romulus, egged on by Mars, led the Roman men to act, abducting the females from their fathers, which resulted in fighting; whereas his wife, in the temple of Juno,[19] led the women to appeal, which reunited them with their fathers and ended the fighting.

The fact that his son's spouse plays such an important part seems to affect substantially Mars' attitude to the events of the story. The god of war, who wants the Romans to fight at 6.371f., is piquantly proud of the person who ended this war, one with men whom he dislikes strongly (3.189ff.), and one for which he was himself ultimately responsible (3.198). He also appears surprisingly sentimental at 3.215ff. over the babies' touching appeals to their grandfathers, and this famous rapist, who recommended the Rape of the Sabines, here shows an unexpected tenderness to one of the victims of the Rape. There is also a certain irreverence towards the famous Romulus (in a narrative by his own father), achieved by means of his elsewhere rather obscure wife. She comes across here as a brave and determined leader in her own right, and also as a shrewd and intelligent one: she carefully justifies her bold plan to the women at 3.207ff.; and it involves extensive appeals by them to the men (3.213f., 219f.) and in particular the masterstroke of taking along the children, and urging, bullying and pinching them into crying for their grandfathers (3.221ff.). In all of this she surpasses Romulus, coming up with an astute solution, when he apparently cannot see beyond (damaging and hitherto inconclusive) hostilities, and moving decisively to put it into effect, actually over-riding him. So too she is a self-starter, whereas he (at 3.197f.) had to be pushed into action by Mars (and it was the more clumsy action of seizure of the Sabines). And Romulus is here downplayed (by Mars!), figuring only at 3.183–6 and 197f., while his wife predominates in the conclusion and has a crucial role, responsible for the whole happy ending.

---

[17] Livy 1.13 does not mention Romulus' wife but has the women of their own accord go between the armies. Dio. Hal. 2.45 depicts a certain Hersilia proposing that the women make overtures to the men and (when they do) begging the Sabine army to make peace; Hersilia is found elsewhere as the name of Romulus' spouse but this Hersilia does not occupy that position. In Plut. *Rom.* 19 the women of their own accord appeal, Hersilia among them (but she is not specified as the wife of Romulus).

[18] The passage does not have much action and actually rambles somewhat (at 183ff., 193ff.) until she turns up at 206; then it gets focus, and significant action begins with the actual nub of the story. She also has the longest speech (longer even than that of Mars at 198, and he is the narrator!), and her vitally important advice and its implementation dominate the conclusion.

[19] The daughter-in-law of Mars in a shrine belonging to the mother of Mars.

Recurring Characters

Naturally in the course of a series of narratives with obvious connections in subject matter many characters reappear, and often there is no particular point to their reappearances; but on several occasions Ovid really achieves something by means of such recurrence, and he demonstrates great versatility in the things that he does so achieve.

In the case of quite widely separated stories some figures remain essentially the same and turn up again and again in a particular function, acquiring a distinct role in the poem and acting as a linking thread: so Hercules is primarily the superhero of the Labours,[20] and Mars is especially the patron god of Rome, fostering its origins and growth.[21] By way of contrast in the case of Romulus we see a variety of traits and functions, with different ones highlighted at different points, as Ovid covers the entire span from conception to deification in nine narratives.[22] These scattered touches eventually come together to form quite a full picture of Romulus, presenting various semes (he is seen to be vigorous, brave, handsome, just, dutiful, generous, simple etc.) and showing his various roles (as fighter, leader, founder, law-giver, dutiful son, loving brother, avenger and so on).

Other passages with recurrent characters are grouped together. Flora has two almost adjoining tales at 5.195ff. and 231ff., and there the point is reinforcement, as Ovid presents her in both as a chatterbox who is eager to impress and build herself up (still more so in the second case).[23] Cybele figures in three closely successive stories at 4.197ff., 223ff. and 249ff., and there is a distinct progression this time, as she changes from a faceless and powerless personage in the first to a powerful divinity (and stern punisher of a mortal) in the second, and then becomes an even more impressive deity (who is kind to a mortal) in the third.[24] With three nearly contiguous narratives connected with Anna Perenna (3.545ff., 663ff., 677ff.) there is an elegant and appropriate arrangement. These are quite different anecdotes and present quite different Annas—the sister of Dido who (amid much parody of the *Aeneid*) was driven into exile, shipwrecked, helped by Aeneas, ravished by Numicius and made into a nymph; the poor old lady who during the secession of the plebs gave the starving people cakes; the goddess who pretended to set up an assignation with Minerva for the love-sick Mars. However, there are links. In each of the trio Anna is the protagonist, the story is an *aetion* and there is play with her role as Helper (see pp. 155f.). In the first and third narratives (which form a frame) the tone is comic, love plays a part, and Anna is a new goddess and is presented in conjunction with a god. In the first and second ones there is a Latium setting and gifts and flight occur.[25] The second and third passages are both much shorter than the first, and in them Anna is static (rather than wandering) and pleases people (firstly the plebs and then Venus) with her actions.[26] The appropriateness of the structure becomes evident when one bears in mind that here Ovid is building on his description of the festival of Anna Perenna at 3.523ff. That festival is depicted as very much a plebeian one (3.525ff.), so it is fitting that the plebs and Anna as a humble old woman occupy a position of central importance in the three related narratives. The rite has its touching aspects (especially 3.542, where an old lady leads along an old man, both of them tipsy) but is above all jovial (3.523, 531ff.), so the affecting tale of Anna's gift of the cakes is present but is dominated by the two humorous passages. In addition, love is a significant element at the festival (3.526, 538 and probably 542), and so figures in the two outer stories.

---

[20] At 1.543ff., 5.381ff., 639ff. and 6.485ff. (but not at 2.305ff.).

[21] At 2.383ff., 481ff., 3.11ff., 49ff., 179ff. and 6.351ff. (but not at 3.677ff.). On Mars in the *Fasti* cf. MERLI 2000 37ff.

[22] 2.361ff., 383ff., 429ff., 481ff., 3.11ff., 49ff., 179ff., 4.809ff. and 5.451ff.

---

[23] See pp. 49ff. There is another noteworthy instance of reinforcement at 1.469ff. and 543ff., where Evander is minimized in both passages (even more so in the second).

[24] See pp. 41ff. There is similar progression at 3.11ff. and 49ff. (where Mars from being very much played down in the first passage achieves prominence at the end of the second).

[25] Anna receives gifts at 3.635f. and gives them at 3.671f. *Fuga* and *(dif)fugio* are found at 3. 555, 565, 579, 609, 641 and 664, with Anna first fleeing herself and then helping those who have fled.

[26] *Gratus* 'pleasing' is repeated at 3.672 and 694.

At 6.105ff. and 131ff. there are two immediately successive anecdotes about Cranae (who is identified with Carna, the goddess of hinges). In the first Cranae is a beautiful but teasing nymph who, when approached by admirers, pretends to consent to sex if they will go ahead to a more secluded spot and then hides behind their back; she tries the same trick with Janus, comically not realizing that he can see behind him, and is easily discovered by the god, who in return for her virginity makes her the goddess of the hinge and gives her a white thorn to repel harm from doors. 6.131ff. begin with a description of the hideous screech-owls which suck children's blood and which attacked the infant Proca, until his nurse appealed to Cranae, who drove them off by performing rituals and placing Janus' white thorn at the boy's window. Two narratives are all very apt in connection with double-headed Janus and the goddess with the dual function of opening and closing (6.102 *numine clausa aperit, claudit aperta suo* 'with her divine power she opens what is closed and closes what is open'), and there is much play with doublets in the course of both groups of lines.[27] The keynote of the recurrence this time is contrast. We are presented with a very different Cranae at 6.131ff., and the impact is heightened by the dislocation there (the sudden lurch to the monstrous screech-owls whose connection with what precedes is initially unclear). In the first (erotic) passage Cranae is a lightweight figure of fun who pretends to be obliging but is impervious to her admirers' approaches; in the second (non-erotic) passage she is a powerful and serious goddess who really is obliging and does respond to the nurse's approach. So too at 6.105ff. Cranae simply gets her comic come-uppance and is worsted by the predator Janus; at 6.131ff. she actually saves the life of an early Alban king and triumphs over the predatory screech-owls.[28] As a final deft touch, although the reader does not realize it at first, 6.127–30 (where Janus recompenses Cranae after the rape) act as a pivot (or hinge) between the two tales:

---

[27] E.g. Janus' two heads and two gifts to Cranae, her twofold reassurance of Proca's nurse and parents, and the touching of the doorway with both arbutus and water.

[28] There is also a contrast between Janus the rapist at 6.105ff. and Janus in his earlier appearance in a narrative at 1.259ff. Cf. NEWLANDS 144.

> 'ius pro concubitu nostro tibi cardinis esto:
>   hoc pretium positae virginitatis habe.'
> sic fatus spinam, qua tristes pellere posset
>   a foribus noxas (haec erat alba) dedit. 130

> 'In return for having intercourse with me let control of hinges be yours: have this reward for the loss of your virginity.' So saying, he gave her a thorn (it was white) so that she could repel grim harm from doors with it.

There the tone becomes more solemn, as transition is made from the sexy nymph to the goddess of the hinge with a new seriousness and importance, and the white thorn which will be used against the screech-owls is introduced, together with the theme of repelling harm from doorways.

One final remarkable instance of recurrence involves a pair of acounts which are three books away from each other. At 6.485ff. Ovid strikingly and intriguingly rings the changes on his earlier characterization of Ino at 3.853ff. In book 3 he tells how queen Ino plotted against her step-children Phrixus and Helle. She instigated women to parch the seed-corn, so that when it was planted it did not sprout; and she bribed a messenger sent to Delphi for advice to report that the infertility would be ended by the sacrifice of Phrixus and Helle. When as a result of her machinations her reluctant husband was about to sacrifice his children, the distraught spirit of their dead mother snatched them away and gave them a golden ram on which to escape. They flew off on this, but Helle fell into the sea (where she became the consort of a sea god), to the great grief of Phrixus, who assumed that she was dead. Ovid is there expanding on his reference to the constellation of the Ram at 3.852, and one would expect that to be the prime focus of the narrative, but it does not appear until as late as 3.867, and most of what precedes the ram concerns Ino's plot. Ovid is building her up there as an evil stepmother to prepare for the surprising contradiction at 6.485ff. and a whole series of echoes, inversions and twists.

In the second account Ino devotedly brings up her nephew Bacchus (when rescued from the incinerated Semele) and thereby incurs the wrath of Juno. The goddess drives Ino's husband mad and he kills one of their children. The sorrowful Ino buries the boy, seizes the other son and leaps into the sea with him, maddened herself. They are saved by some sea nymphs and taken to the mouth of the Tiber. There Juno sets some bacchantes on to the miserable mother, but Hercules comes to the rescue. Finally Ino finds refuge with the prophetess Carmentis, who predicts the end of their troubles and the deification of Ino and her son, which duly takes place. The (rather eerie) echoes include female persecutors, who persuade other women to support them, but ultimately fail; miraculous escapes from death; Ino's unsuccessful attempts to kill children; and prophecy. The major inversions are Ino no longer wicked but actually good (a kind aunt instead of an evil stepmother), and a victim rather than a persecutor, and at the end deified (instead of showing contempt for the gods). The twists usually involve an element of tit for tat (a sort of poetic justice): Ino herself becomes the innocent victim of a persecutor (and a more powerful and relentless one), and women are instigated against her; she loses one of her own children and grieves over the loss; she herself plunges into the sea and becomes an unhappy mother (6.517).

One final complication in connection with these two groups of lines deserves mention. The second is inspired by Bacchus, and it may be that Ovid is there just contradicting the earlier depiction of Ino (by the poet himself), leaving us to wonder if Bacchus is giving us the plain truth or (as an indebted nephew) presenting a partial and coloured account. However, Ovid also offers ways of reconciling the discrepancies. At 6.553–5 he reports that Ino's husband had an affair with one of his slave girls (so we could infer that a basically decent Ino found out and, carried away by jealousy etc., tried to get at him through his children). But then comes another explanation: at 6.555f. Ovid states that the story about the parching of the corn seed arose with the slave girl, and Ino denied it (so it is possible that there is a false tradition at 3.853ff.). Then again, Ovid at 6.553ff. is presumably still under the inspiration of Bacchus (see 6.481–4), and the god obviously would favour his aunt and so may not be reliable. Maddeningly this tangled mass of possibilities is left unresolved by our tricky poet.

Greimas' Actant Model

In many of the narratives in the *Fasti* characters aspire towards certain aims, often meeting resistance and receiving assistance, and in these cases the actant model[29] is a useful analytical tool. Although

---

[29] On which see especially GREIMAS 1987 106ff. and BAL 23ff. It has come in for criticism, but it is still an illuminating way of looking at characters, and it does yield interesting and significant results.

Ovid will not have thought specifically in Greimas' terms, he did clearly make characters perform the roles noted by Greimas. To put it briefly and simply, this critic identified six actants—the Subject (a person or thing who wants someone or something); the Object (who or what the Subject wants); the Opponent (a person/thing opposing the Subject); the Helper (a person or thing giving the Subject incidental aid, without the Sender's power over the whole enterprize); the Sender (someone or something actually supplying the Object or allowing it to be supplied); and the Receiver (the person or thing receiving the Object). So, for example, Evan (the Subject) wants to marry Katherine (the Object); Katherine's sister (the Opponent) objects that Evan is too poor, but Evan's brother (the Helper) gives him a lucrative job; so Katherine's father (the Sender) gives his consent to the marriage, and Evan then marries her and becomes the Receiver. It will be seen from this example that roles can change (the Subject often becomes the Receiver, and Objects can become Senders, as would have happened here if Katherine had bypassed her father and consented to the marriage herself).

Sometimes a role is kept secret, and sometimes we find false rather than genuine actants. At 2.687ff. Tarquinius Superbus (the Subject) wants to capture Gabii (the Object); there is resistance on the part of the men of Gabii (the Opponents), but he sends his son Sextus to worm his way into their confidence and then intimates that he should kill the leading citizens; Sextus (the Sender) duly does this and hands over the town to Tarquinius Superbus (who now becomes the Receiver). Here the Sender conceals his true role until the very end. In addition, when he first arrives at the town and the men bare their swords, Sextus tells them to kill him, pretending that his father hates him and would want that. He thereby poses as the Object of Tarquinius (supposedly the Subject who wants to murder him). Then, when the men are taken in and ask him to aid them in the war, he agrees to do that, giving the impression of being a Helper. This secrecy and falsity in connection with roles brings out well just how cunning, slippery, underhand and untrustworthy Sextus is.

Roles often change, making for an interesting intricacy, but such change can also enhance the impact of a narrative. At 2.585ff. Jupiter (the Subject) wants to rape Juturna (the Object), but is thwarted by her sister nymph Lara (the Opponent), who warns Juturna and Juno. At that Jupiter (now the second Subject) wants to punish Lara (the second Object) and does so, by ripping out her tongue and sending her down to the Underworld by means of Mercury (the Helper). Then Mercury (now the third Subject) decides to rape Lara (the third Obect) and does so despite her mute appeal. The alterations of role for Lara and Mercury are shockingly abrupt and drastic. There is a grim decline for the nymph from effective and amusing Opponent of a rape to ineffectual and pathetic Object of a violent punishment and rape. There is a chilling progression for the god from rather questionable Helper to clearly callous Subject, as he suddenly becomes far more dominant and from assisting in the punishment of a rapist's Opponent turns into a rapist himself.[30]

At 2.155ff., in an even more extensive complex of actants, there is a very functional patterning and multiplication of roles. Callisto (the first Subject) wants to preserve her virginity (the Object) but is foiled because of the contrary aim of Jupiter. He (the second Subject) wants to rape Callisto (the Object) and does so. Next, when Callisto's pregnancy is revealed, Diana (the third Subject) decides to penalize Callisto (the Object) and does penalize her by expelling her from her band of nymphs. Then Juno (the fourth Subject) also wants to punish Callisto (the Object) and does so by changing her into a bear. Years later, when Callisto's own son, out hunting, is about to shoot her, Jupiter[31] (the fifth Subject) decides to rescue Callisto (the Object) and saves her by transferring her and her son to the sky as stars. But Juno (the sixth Subject) wants to chastise further Callisto (the Object) and so prevents her setting. There is a lively intersection of a whole series of actants, and several of the Subjects (Callisto and Jupiter; Juno and Jupiter) have dramatically conflicting purposes.[32] For variety in his two appearances as Subject Jupiter is first malign and then benign. More significantly, and dispiritingly, Juno is malicious in both her appearances (cruel in her first attack and remorseless with the second), and she and Diana are fully aligned and reinforce one another in their punishment of Callisto. The cruelly maltreated nymph figures as a Subject only briefly at the start, and she is the only one in this account who does not achieve her aim. She is then overwhelmed by a full five divine Subjects, who all become Receivers and do so rapidly thanks to their power. As Object on five occasions, Callisto is first raped and then persecuted three times (with Jupiter's brief rescue swamped by the extensive surrounding retribution). All of this comes together to form a bleak picture of Callisto as a hopelessly inferior and powerless victim of heaven.

---

[30] The analysis of actants also highlights the male domination here: all the Subjects are masculine and major divinities, while all the Objects are weaker females (mere nymphs).

[31] It seems both obvious and natural to assume that the lover and father Jupiter is the one behind the stellification at 2.188ff., as he is at *Met.* 2.505ff.

[32] A linking thread is provided by the loss of Callisto's virginity, to which all the Subjects respond in some way.

Ovid was particularly interested in the Helper, and it is instructive to examine his treatment of this actant. Versatility is again evident, in the varied nature of both the Helper and the help given. No two Helpers are exactly the same and many of them differ considerably. In the *Fasti* this actant can be male or female; young or old; a human, a divinity, an animal[33] or even inanimate.[34] There may be single or multiple Helpers within a story. Most often they are genuine, but there are also false Helpers and those who cannot or will not offer succour.[35] Most of them assist with virtuous aims, but sometimes their aid is of dubious morality or clearly immoral.[36] They are frequently set against Opponents, and in just over half the cases they are worsted by the Opponents. The majority of Helpers are not very prominent and do not overshadow the Subject, but on a few occasions they dominate the narrative and the Subject.[37] Usually assistance is given deliberately, but it can also be unwitting.[38] It ranges all the way from minimal to vital importance,[39] and it takes the form of giving information, advice or encouragement, blocking or providing access, fetching or moving something, attacking, killing, rescuing and so on.

Ovid also makes clever play with this actant. A good example of this occurs at 2.247ff. (where Apollo is lied to by the raven, sees through the lie and punishes the bird):

> forte Iovi Phoebus festum sollemne parabat
>   (non faciet longas fabula nostra moras):
> 'i, mea' dixit 'avis, ne quid pia sacra moretur,
>   et tenuem vivis fontibus adfer aquam.' 250
> corvus inauratum pedibus cratera recurvis
>   tollit et aerium pervolat altus iter.

---

[33] The dolphin at 2.83ff., the raven at 2.247ff.
[34] The wind at 3.599f.
[35] E.g. Anna at 3.685ff., the rustics at 4.487f. and the Satyrs at 3.755ff.
[36] At 2.597f., 3.853ff., 6.513ff. etc.
[37] Most notably Carmentis at 1.469ff. and Mezentius at 4.879ff.
[38] E.g. at 3.599f. and 4.423ff.
[39] Cf. e.g. 3.759 and 2.113f.

> stabat adhuc duris ficus densissima pomis:
> temptat eam rostro, non erat apta legi;
> immemor imperii sedisse sub arbore fertur, 255
> dum fierent tarda dulcia poma mora.
> iamque satur nigris longum rapit unguibus hydrum,
> ad dominumque redit, fictaque verba refert:
> 'hic mihi causa morae, vivarum obsessor aquarum:
> hic tenuit fontes officiumque meum.' 260

> Apollo chanced to be making preparations for a solemn festival in honour of Jupiter (my story will not delay you for long). He said, 'My bird, so nothing delays the sacred rite, go and fetch a little water from a flowing spring.' With its hooked feet the raven lifted up a gilded bowl and flew on high through the sky. There stood a fig-tree laden with fruit that was still hard. The bird tried it with its beak; it wasn't ready for picking. They say that it sat beneath the tree, ignoring its orders, waiting until the fruit should sweeten after a long delay. After finally eating its fill, it seized a long watersnake in its black talons and returned to its master with this fabrication: 'This was the cause of my delay—it besieged the flowing water, occupying the spring and keeping me from doing my duty.'

There the Subject Apollo sends off the raven as Helper, but the raven dallies, and so becomes the Opponent. When the figs finally ripen, the raven returns with the water, and so reverts to being the Helper, but obviously turns up too late, and so is a decidedly unhelpful Helper. The bird also takes the watersnake with it (as its own, equally unsuccessful, Helper), claiming that the snake was an Opponent.

A much more involved and ambitious instance of such play is found at 3.545ff. in connection with Anna, Dido's Helper in the *Aeneid* (and Ovid's first two lines there, with their mention of Dido's love for Aeneas and her suicide on the pyre, allude to the two areas in which Anna notably rendered assistance). When the Numidians invade Carthage after Dido's death, the Subject Anna goes into exile, looking for a secure new home. This famous Virgilian Helper here has her own Helpers—her companions on the voyage (3.565) and king Battus, who initially allows her to settle on Melite (until her brother turns up, looking for her). Anna then flees to Camere, and in her flight is aided by her crew, opposed by a storm (which blows her back out to sea) and then aided again by a great blast of wind (which drives her to shore in Latium). Shipwrecked there, she acquires a new Helper—Aeneas (whom she initially views as an Opponent). He supports her in her plight just as he had been supported in a similar plight by Dido and apparently by Anna herself (3.623, 630). He asks his wife

Lavinia to succour her also, and she pretends to do so, but she is a false Helper, suspicious of Anna and planning her death. At this point the ghost of Dido (who had been helped by Anna) turns up as a Helper to Anna, urging her to save herself by running away (Dido, who at *Aeneid* 4.416ff. had begged Anna to support her by asking Aeneas not to leave Carthage, here supports Anna by telling her to leave Aeneas' home). When Anna does flee, she is ravished and given her new home by Numicius, and at 3.653f. seems happy enough with the situation (giving in to his love, as she had advised Dido to give in to her love when offering assistance at *Aen.* 4.31ff.). On top of that, in the next two narratives (which follow on closely) Anna reappears in her role as Helper. At 3.663ff. she is a genuine Helper (the poor old lady who gives the plebs cakes). Then at 3.677ff. she only pretends to give aid and is a false Helper to Mars, who wants to have an affair with Minerva and (like Dido) asks Anna for support in connection with his doomed love.[40] So we have a trio of Anna stories which sport in various ways with help for this renowned Helper.

Minimized and Elided Characters

In the mythical and legendary narratives of the *Fasti* (especially the short ones) many minor and major characters are played down or totally omitted simply as part of the streamlining process; but there are also times when it seems that there is particular point and such minimizing and eliding are subtly suggestive and variously effective. So at 1.363ff. (as part of his polemical engagement with Virgil) Ovid surprisingly omits Orpheus and Eurydice.[41] There is also independence and some irreverence too in the contracted roles and diminished standing for Aeneas, Turnus and Dido in the *Fasti*.[42] Then again Ovid also reduces the part of some characters so that another figure in the story can achieve a new eminence: for example, we have already seen (at pp. 145ff.) how Romulus was skimmed at 3.179ff. to allow his wife to be highlighted, and the same thing happens at 5.451ff. to permit Remus to dominate.[43]

---

[40] Mars' words at 3.682 recall Dido at *Aen.* 4.1f. For the various links with *Aeneid* 4 here see pp. 111ff.

[41] See p. 110.

[42] See pp. 120ff.

[43] See pp. 54ff. Carmentis at 1.469ff. and Tullia at 6.587ff. are also played up in this way: see pp. 34f., 123f., 203f.

This technique has a teasing function at 5.495ff. That narrative is introduced at 493f. with a couplet announcing that Ovid will now tell of the origin of the constellation Orion, so that one naturally presumes that Orion will be the focus of the ensuing tale. However, we only get to him in the fortieth line of the passage. Before that Ovid mischievously holds him back in the course of many leisurely verses on Hyrieus (who is rewarded for his hospitality to Jupiter, Neptune and Mercury by the creation of Orion as a son for him). Ovid there even informs us of the time of the day when Hyrieus entertained the gods, the state of the fire in his hearth, what he cooked for the gods and the nature of his crockery. When we do finally reach Orion, the actual account of the stellification occupies only eight lines and is unsatisfyingly brief and perfunctory, especially in contrast to all the expansiveness and detail in connection with Hyrieus.[44]

Rapists are sometimes shadowy figures, hardly in evidence at all. In the passage on the assault on Rhea Silvia (3.11ff.) only 21f. are devoted to Mars and the rape itself is over within that single couplet, which diminishes the god somewhat and also intimates that he was a fast worker and very aroused as well.[45] In the version of the abduction of Persephone by her uncle Dis at 4.419ff. the god appears in only two and a half lines. At 4.445f. he catches sight of her as she is picking flowers:

> hanc videt et visam patruus velociter aufert
>   regnaque caeruleis in sua portat equis.

> Her uncle saw her and quickly carried off what he saw, taking her to his own realm by means of his dusky horses.

A few lines later (in 449) we are told that a way opened up to Dis and his team of horses, and that is the last time that Dis figures in this narrative. With shocking suddenness and divine ease the god sees and abducts very rapidly. It is also apt that this personage who is not of our world and who hides himself and his prey away in the Underworld should be nowhere in evidence for most of the lines, especially during Ceres' futile search. In the tale of Callisto at 2.155ff., after a preamble on the nymph's vow to remain a virgin, Jupiter puts in his only actual appearance in the narrative at 161f.:

---

[44] On the various possibilities open to Ovid in connection with Orion's death see further NEWLANDS 111f.

[45] Cf. pp. 70 and 91f.

> foedera servasset, si non formosa fuisset:
> cavit mortales, de Iove crimen habet.
>
> She would have kept her vow, if she hadn't been beautiful: she stayed away from mortals, became culpable thanks to Jupiter.

There, in the briefest of mentions, Jupiter has her in half a line, with a speed that suggests a masterful, irresistible onslaught. Despite that poor Callisto is punished, by Diana and by Juno, who turns her into a bear. When, fifteen years later, her son while out hunting is about to shoot her, she and the boy are translated to the sky as stars, presumably by Jupiter, but we are not explicitly told that (so that here he would be a rather mysterious force in the background, perhaps reflecting an attempt on his part to avoid Juno's notice). The god's lack of involvement in the narrative may also be intended to suggest that he was not that involved emotionally with Callisto.[46]

This skimming technique is also employed to ensure a sharp focus. At 2.195ff. (on the death of the Fabii), in contrast to Livy 2.48ff., Ovid has nothing on the people of Rome, the senate, the consul Caeso Fabius or the legions led to help the Fabii by Lucius Aemilius. Instead he keeps a sharp and dramatic focus throughout on the Fabii and their Etruscan enemy (the protagonists and antagonists), with no other characters present to distract from that; and, as this passage is in celebration of the Fabii, they predominate, figuring in 22 verses as opposed to the enemy's 13 lines.[47] Something similar but slightly different happens with the story of Lucretia at 2.711ff. That begins with various characters and quite crowded scenes, but suddenly at 769–812 all the other people fall away and only Sextus and Lucretia are before our eyes, for a long stretch, as he is moved by his passion to go back to visit her and sexually assault her. There is nobody else to draw our attention away from him (and his lust, obsession and callousness) or from her (and her innocence and vulnerability), so that the brutal act of rape has an undiluted impact on us. In addition, there is nobody to protect Lucretia and nobody to restrain Sextus by acting as a witness or trying to dissuade him, so that she is isolated and he is unstoppable. There is also much pointed contrast with the first visit: there, as part of a light-hearted contest over the fidelity of their wives, Sextus and Lucretia's husband and other Roman nobles found her chastely spinning in the midst of her slave-girls and she was joyfully reunited with her loving husband.

---

[46] Cf. also FRÉCAUT 295 on Jupiter's minimal role here (in contrast to the *Metamorphoses*).

[47] Similarly throughout 5.605ff. the spotlight is on Jupiter and Europa alone (with no companions for the heroine, no Mercury, no Graces etc. as found in other versions), and throughout 2.305ff. there is hardly anyone else to divert us from Faunus, Omphale and Hercules (the rapist and his two victims).

Minor Characters

Minor characters[48] in these narratives are almost always unobtrusive and unimportant, present simply to flesh out a scene, provide background or do something purely functional (like rowing a boat or giving information) to keep the plot moving. However, unpredictable as ever, Ovid occasionally gives them a more substantial role, employing them for a range of more significant purposes.

At 1.395ff. Ovid begins his narrative of Priapus' thwarted assault on Lotis at a festival of Bacchus by describing the crowd of playful and lascivious country gods and seductive nymphs who also attended (for text and translation see pp. 81ff.). By means of these minor characters Ovid builds up a light-hearted and erotic atmosphere which is both apt and tricky.[49] With a full twenty lines on these figures (grouped together for cumulative impact) he also creates anticipation of sexual activity, while simultaneously holding back the account of Priapus' rape attempt, so that there is a decided build-up to it. These gods and goddesses provide a crowded backdrop for the solitary Priapus' attack on the lone Lotis (ensuring that these two really stand out as the poet zooms in on them),[50] and they facilitate movement from the general to the particular, from the aroused to the most aroused of all.[51]

At 2.383ff., in a passage that explains the derivation of the name of the Lupercal (from *lupa*, the she-wolf that suckled Romulus and Remus), Ovid begins with Silvia giving birth to the twins and Amulius ordering their drowning. Ovid quickly gets on to the servants charged with carrying out this order:

---

[48] On this generally neglected aspect of narrative see especially GALEF.

[49] See pp. 226f.

[50] After 415 there are only very brief allusions to the nymphs and country gods in 416 and 422 until the failure of Priapus.

[51] Ovid does something similar with the country deities at 6.321ff., but much

iussa recusantes peragunt lacrimosa ministri
  (flent tamen) et geminos in loca sola ferunt.
Albula, quem Tiberim mersus Tiberinus in undis
  reddidit, hibernis forte tumebat aquis: 390
hic, ubi nunc fora sunt, lintres errare videres,
  quaque iacent valles, Maxime Circe, tuae.
huc ubi venerunt (neque enim procedere possunt
  longius), ex illis unus et alter ait:
'at quam sunt similes! at quam formosus uterque! 395
  plus tamen ex illis iste vigoris habet.
si genus arguitur voltu, nisi fallit imago,
  nescioquem in vobis suspicor esse deum.
at siquis vestrae deus esset originis auctor,
  in tam praecipiti tempore ferret opem: 400
ferret opem certe, si non ope, mater, egeret,
  quae facta est uno mater et orba die.
nata simul, moritura simul, simul ite sub undas
  corpora.' desierat, deposuitque sinu.
vagierunt ambo pariter: sensisse putares; 405
  hi redeunt udis in sua tecta genis.

Reluctantly the servants carried out his lamentable orders (but in tears) and took the twins to a lonely spot. It so happened that the Albula (renamed the Tiber after Tiberinus drowned in its waves) was swollen with winter rain. Here you would have seen small boats floating about where the forums now are and where your valley is situated, Circus Maximus. When they arrived here (for they couldn't go any further), one or the other of them said: 'Ah, how alike they are! Ah, how handsome each of them is! But this one is the livelier of the pair. If features reveal parentage, unless I'm deceived by appearances I suspect some divinity in you two. But if some divinity was behind your birth, he would be helping you at such a crisis. Your mother certainly would be helping you, if she didn't need help herself, bearing and losing her children on one and the same day. Bodies born together and about to die together, sink beneath the waves together!' He stopped speaking, lowered them from his chest and put them down. They both wailed in unison (you'd have thought they understood). The men went home with tears on their cheeks.

---

more concisely. So too at 6.105ff. Cranae's tricked suitors make for an appropriate eroticism, contribute substantially to the humour and arouse expectations (of a come-uppance for Cranae). In addition, they act as a foil for Janus (these numerous, unnamed minor characters who do not succeed in bedding Cranae throw into relief the single, named major character who does succeed). Just remove them to see how stark and spare the story would be without them.

The remainder of the narrative tells how when they were left high and dry by the receding water, the she-wolf came to the unperturbed twins, licked them into shape and gave them milk.

Unusually the major personages are played down and there is a novel[52] and striking emphasis on the servants and their feelings, which provides a brand new slant and emotional impact for this old story. Showing the reactions of ordinary, decent people to Amulius' order, and making him appear even more of a tyrant (as they are forced to carry out his savage command),[53] they do much to bring out the horror and the pathos. They are used to catch the terrible moment of the committal to the water, and there is an immediacy to the quite long and animated speech by one of them. That speaker consistently underlines the heinousness of the king's actions (in 395, 397f., 400, 401, 402 and 403), and is feeling (so that Amulius seems even more callous) and perceptive about the twins' divine origins (which means that the king is either dull-witted or did see the signs of divinity and still wanted to kill the boys). That speech is framed by tears (in 388 and 406), which are supplemented by the wailing at 405.

These minor characters are also used to prefigure the wolf's intervention[54] (they care for the children as it will; the allusion to Mars as the father in 398 looks forward to the appearance of his creature; and the twofold reference to help in 400f. is clearly proleptic). They also highlight the animal. They are part of the doublets (two servants; two children; uncle Amulius and neice Rhea Silvia in 2.383f.) against which the single wolf stands out. Their lines build up the aura of death (begun in 2.385) at 2.389, 400 and 403, to accentuate the she-wolf's gift of life. Sympathetic but unable to help, they abandon the babies, and one of them uses his tongue to lament and puts the (wailing) twins down from his chest, whereas the she-wolf goes to the babies and does help them, using her tongue to lick them into shape and taking the (unafraid) twins to her teats.

At 4.503ff. in the midst of her search for the abducted Persephone the miserable Ceres sits motionless on a rock in Attica for many days. A humble old man called Celeus on his way home with his daughter comes across Ceres (disguised as an old woman), and when they hear that she has lost her daughter they weep, and the old man invites her into his simple home. In his hut there is great grief because his baby son (Triptolemus) is dangerously ill and cannot sleep; but Ceres kisses the child and reinvigorates him, to the great joy of Celeus and his wife and daughter. Ceres refuses their offer of food and gives the boy some poppies in milk to help him sleep. That night she also tries to purge away Triptolemus' mortality in the fire, but his mother grabs him, thinking that she is saving him from harm. Ceres gently explains that he will now be mortal but he will at least be the inventor of ploughing, and then she leaves, off on her travels again.

---

[52] Cf. HEINZE 327, LE BONNIEC 1969 61.

[53] See 2.387. The servants are not unwilling in Livy 1.4, Dio. Hal. 1.79 or Plut. *Rom.* 3.

[54] And Romulus' eventual prominence (see 2.396 and the ironical 2.403).

Here too the minor figures make for poignancy,[55] but this time the pathos is mixed with humour[56] and irony (e.g. Ceres can help others and make them happy but not herself; she can rescue the boy from the Underworld but not her own daughter; the family offer food to the goddess of agriculture, who is fasting anyway). There is also foreshadowing again, but here it is more extensive and complex: for instance, Celeus as Helper prefigures Helice and Sol as Helpers; Ceres as Helper anticipates the way in which she will act as her own Helper at 4.611ff. by threatening suicide; here, as later, Ceres achieves success (saving Triptolemus from death's realm, as she will save Persephone) but only a partial success (she fails to make Triptolemus immortal, as she will fail to get back her daughter for all of the time).

This episode with its intimate glimpses is also used to develop Ceres' character and win more sympathy for her. Here for the first time in the whole narrative she comes alive (as something more than just a grieving, searching mother), is properly in contact with people and thereby reveals her beneficent nature (for example, in the midst of her own troubles she is very kind to Triptolemus, and she is tolerant towards his misguided mother). There are significant structural considerations too. Celeus and his family provide welcome variety in the midst of Ceres' long quest, a still centre among all the wandering, and emotion amid the rather dry lists of places visited by Ceres (at 4.467ff., 4999ff. and 563ff.). They also build effective parallels (e.g. the grieving family reinforce the goddess' grief and so increase the sadness) and contrasts (e.g. Celeus with his daughter and the rest of his family underscores Ceres' isolation and the absence of her child).[57]

---

[55] For example, Celeus and his daughter weep and show a touching concern for Ceres. See further FANTHAM 1998 190, 194.

[56] See pp. 79ff.

Developed Characters

Although the vast majority of Ovid's characters are narrative devices which are there to do functional things and have little or no personality of their own, Ovid was also perfectly capable of building up full and memorable personages when he chose to do so.[58] He did choose to do so at least once in each book (with Carmentis and Cacus; Sextus and Lucretia; Numa and Ariadne; Ceres and Romulus; Flora and Remus; and Tullia),[59] and he employed a variety of techniques of characterization in these cases. The most developed and the most interesting out of all these is Sextus—a striking figure, consistent and coherent, dark but (realistically) not entirely bad, and brought alive by means of some graphic and distinctive touches.

First impressions are important, and Sextus makes a chilling initial appearance at 2. 687ff. (for text and translation see pp. 229f.), which he dominates. There, with the taking of Gabii, Ovid ushers him in as a distinct villain (arousing strong emotions to draw us in and prejudicing us strongly against him from the start) and he also foreshadows much of what follows in the rape of Lucretia, where Sextus goes from bad to worse.[60] The only instance of direct characterization is *callidus* ('crafty') in 2.700, so that really stands out and gets the attention. The statement in 2.691 that Sextus clearly took after his father is an economical way of attaching to him the (largely negative) traits of Tarquinius Superbus just conveyed at 2.688–90 (injustice, courage in war, duplicity etc.). Still more economical is the indirect characterization in this revealing incident, as one can easily infer a wide range of attributes—the prince is daring, determined, unscrupulous, cunning, ruthless, efficient etc.[61] There is also an unsettling combination of vices and (perverted) virtues (eloquence, intelligence, bravery and *pietas* 'dutifulness' to Tarquin), so that Sextus comes across as a formidable figure and there is a dispiriting sense of inexorable progress in connection with the rape of Lucretia. There is the telling detail of Sextus even undergoing a flogging to trick the enemy and the vivid viewing of the scars in the moonlight (2.696f.). In addition, Ovid here establishes Sextus as a creature of the night (even perhaps a power of darkness) with his nocturnal approach to Gabii (cf. the nocturnal visits to Lucretia at 2.735 and 792), and night and its blackness pointedly conjure up gloom, concealment, blindness, furtive love and death. In general these first impressions are all very apt, with one deliberate exception: Sextus here seems to be without feeling in his onslaught on Gabii, which means that his subsequent passion in connection with Lucretia has still more impact.

---

[57] Ovid's departures here from his model (*Homeric Hymn* 2) often demonstrate his greater dexterity in the handling of minor characters. For instance, he makes his Celeus more emotive (a poor old man with a sick son, rather than a king) and portrays him with his daughter (only one in Ovid) at the start, making the antithesis with Ceres clearer. Cf. HINDS 1987b 63ff. and FANTHAM 1998 188.

[58] Obviously, given constraints of space, he could not develop his people to the same exent that an epic poet could or a modern novelist can, but we still find complex and amply fleshed out characters in the *Fasti*.

[59] 1.469ff., 543ff.; 2.687ff., 711ff.; 3.277ff., 461ff.; 4.419ff., 809ff.; 5.195ff., 451ff.; 6.587ff.

[60] See p. 231.

At 2.711ff. Sextus reappears.[62] There Ovid tells how when the Romans were besieging the nearby town of Ardea, a contest about their wives arose between Sextus and his companions and at the suggestion of Collatinus they rode back home to check on their spouses. Collatinus won the contest (his wife Lucretia was found chastely spinning among her maids), but Sextus became inflamed with lust for her and later returned and raped her at sword point. She told her husband and father before committing suicide, and then Brutus avenged her by driving out the Tarquin dynasty. Apart from the exception just noted, the prince's second appearance is generally consistent with and reinforces the first. Many of the same semes are again in evidence, but this time (as we see his amatory rather than military side) for a fuller and rounder portrayal there are some new ones, such as his lustfulness, obsessiveness, perversity (2.765f.) and self-indulgence. The process of undermining Sextus' qualities is continued here, but in a more developed form. He had shown some bravery in going to Gabii without any weapons and operating there on his own, but this is now succeeded by a cowardly armed attack on a lone and defenceless woman.[63] The *pietas* ('dutifulness') that he had demonstrated in obeying his father over Gabii is followed by contrasting *impietas* in his assault on a woman related to him by marriage.[64] His eloquence and intelligence are employed at 2.807ff. in intimidating Lucretia into putting up with his advances. Ovid also gives Sextus a new virtue—hospitality (when he entertains Collatinus and the others in the camp at 2.725f.)—only for him to abuse the hospitality of Collatinus' wife when he makes his second visit there and she entertains him prior to the rape.

---

[61] Cf. pp. 101 and 189f.

[62] Cf. pp. 195ff. for a comparison between Livy's Sextus and Ovid's here.

[63] Instead of going (*venio* in 2.692, 794) at night (*nox* in 2.692, 792) among the armed enemy, he goes into the lone Lucretia's bedroom, is an enemy himself (*hostis* in 2.787, 790; cf. 2.692) and is himself armed with a sword (at 2.793, 795; cf. 2.693) for use against a helpless female.

Some new techniques of characterization are also in evidence. For example, in the second passage there are some (suggestive and picturesque) similes. Sextus was first inflamed with desire for Lucretia during the visit with the other husbands to check on the wives, and after he returned from that visit he could not get her out of his mind. At 2.775ff. Ovid describes his state at this point:

> ut solet a magno fluctus languescere flatu, 775
> sed tamen a vento, qui fuit, unda tumet,
> sic, quamvis aberat placitae praesentia formae,
> quem dederat praesens forma, manebat amor.

> Just as after a great gale the waves are accustomed to decrease, but the sea is nevertheless swollen by the wind that was, so the passion remained which her beauty had inspired by its presence, even though the beauty was absent that had attracted him when present.

Primarily the image illustrates the initially great and still present effect of Lucretia's attractions, but in addition, like Sextus, the sea here is ominously seething beneath the surface, and the sea in general is a powerful, dangerous, harmful and destructive element that cannot be resisted. There is an even more eloquent image a little later (at 2.799f.), when Sextus (sword in hand), enters Lucretia's bedroom, climbs on to the bed and threatens the terrified woman. In her shock she says nothing:

> sed tremit, ut quondam stabulis deprensa relictis
> parva sub infesto cum iacet agna lupo. 800

> But she trembles, as a small lamb does sometimes when it has left the fold and been pounced on and lies beneath a vicious wolf.

Wolves generally were viewed as ravening, rapacious, savage, bold and violent,[65] and this particular one is described as *infesto* (translated as 'vicious', this word combines the senses 'hostile', 'aggressive', 'taking the offensive' and 'threatening').[66] Sextus is also depicted as a bigger and much stronger predator actually on top of the woman, focused, determined, about to inflict pain without any misgivings or remorse, and with no possibility of his relenting.

---

[64] 2.788. Collatinus was a Tarquin (see FRAZER II 507).

[65] See *TLL* VII,2.1857.16ff.

There is obvious colouring in that, and elsewhere too Ovid often colours his account of the rape. What Sextus does is bad enough in itself, but Ovid presents it in such a way as to strengthen greatly our feelings of revulsion and hatred towards the man (really involving readers). So he builds up Lucretia[67] and Collatinus as sympathetic figures, highlights their great love (prior to its defilement)[68] and catches vividly Lucretia's shock and terror during the rape.[69] So too he includes outrageous details (e.g. Sextus is actually aroused by Lucretia's incorruptible chastity; he of all people threatens to accuse her of adultery; and he rejoices over the success of the assault). Ovid is also explicit in his condemnation at times: for instance, he depicts Sextus in 2.787 as an enemy in the guise of a guest (with the jingling *hostis ut hospes*) and in 2.805 as a loving enemy (with the paradoxical *amans hostis*), and at 2.779f. he lets his disgust permeate a whole couplet (on Sextus' decision to rape Lucretia):

> ardet, et iniusti stimulis agitatus amoris
>   comparat indigno vimque metumque toro.

> He burned and, driven by the goading of an unjust passion, plotted dreadful violence against a marriage which didn't deserve that.

Antithesis is also employed for delineation, throwing into relief several of Sextus' failings. In fact he contrasts markedly with all the other main characters in this story. He looks bad beside Lucretia's father (with his tender care and affection for her) and beside Brutus (who is noble and brave, reveres Lucretia etc.). He looks even worse beside Collatinus (with his ingenuousness, pride in his wife, fidelity and loving concern for her) and especially beside his victim (who is faithful and chaste, has a great and wholesome love for her spouse, is gentle, honourable, courageous etc.). It is also worth noting that there is reinforcement in connection with Sextus' character: the only other bad people in this narrative are his father and brothers (briefly) in 2.851 and more noticeably his wife (who at 2.737ff. is discovered behaving in a far from chaste and decorous manner),[70] and it says something about Sextus that he has such a spouse.[71]

---

[66] See *OLD* s.v. 1, 2, 3a, *TLL* VII,1.1406.57ff.

[67] On Lucretia's qualities see pp. 197ff., HEINZE 345 and LEE.

[68] *Imago* 'image' is a clear link between 2.753 and 769. In the former line Lucretia feels fear when she pictures her absent husband fighting, whereas in the latter Sextus feels lust when he pictures the absent Lucretia.

[69] Cf. RICHLIN 172 (on the unpleasantly explicit detail in connection with the attack) and also p. 21 above.

In Sextus' much longer second passage there is lots more scope for direct characterization. An analysis of the epithets applied to him at 2.711ff. shows that his warlike side comes in for emphasis there. In addition to *infesto* at 2.800 (discussed above), he is called *hostis* 'enemy' (to Lucretia) a full three times (2.787, 790, 805) and *victor* 'victor' (after his successful rape of her) in 2.811; and he is described at 2.725, 768 and 785 as a *iuvenis*, a word which means 'young man' and is used especially of warriors[72] (note also the accentuation of his use of the sword at 2.784, 793 and 802). Such bellicosity picks up from the Gabii story but is totally inappropriate in connection with Lucretia (a female relative who is treated as a military objective: see 2.783), and it intimates that Sextus is incorrigibly aggressive and incapable of normal human interaction and real love. The epithets also bring out Sextus' regal status: he is designated as the king's son or the royal youth at 2.726, 761 and 796 (and he is referred to as Tarquinius at 2.725, 796 and 825, while there is allusion to his kingdom at 2.812). Ovid thus underlines Sextus' power, his misconduct towards his own subjects and his connection with his hated and immoral father. Especially stressed is Sextus' violent and obsessive passion at 2.761ff. (for text and translation see p. 196), by means of two clusters of powerful adjectives, nouns and verbs (and also by a flurry of mixed imagery). In fact almost all of the verbs applied to Sextus are concerned with his lust and the resultant rape,[73] so that there is a tight focus on all of that, with little to distract or mitigate. Speech is important: Sextus is the subject of verbs of speaking in 726 (where his words questioning the fidelity of the Roman wives set off the whole train of events leading to the rape), in 781 and 783 (where he psychs himself up for the assault) and in 796 and 807 (where he comes out with threats that facilitate the rape). There is also a whole series of other verbs which denote different acts connected with the attack, as Sextus plans it, arms and travels, enters Lucretia's home, gets up from bed that night and takes out his sword, enters her bedroom, climbs on to her bed, presses her, has a temporary setback when he fails to win her over, and then (after his final, successful speech) rejoices over his victory.[74] In general the verbs applied directly to Sextus represent him as vigorous and decisive. He is the object only once,[75] the subject of five passive verbs[76] and the subject of 22 active verbs (a process begun at 2.687ff., where he was always the subject of active verbs), so that very largely he is someone who does things rather than having them done to him. Sextus is a speaker and above all a doer, a man of action.

---

[70] She drinks wine, breaking with custom and offending against contemporary notions of decency (cf. Val. Max. 2.1.5, 6.3.9).

[71] So too his faults at 2.687ff. were complemented by those of his father. It seems as if it was a thoroughly bad family.

[72] See *OLD* s.v. 1b, *TLL* VII,2.735.77ff., 736.1ff.

[73] There are only three that do not have this direct connection (in 726, 768 and 791).

One final clever touch deserves mention. Sextus in many ways recalls the standard lover of earlier Latin elegy, which leads one to compare the prince with that figure and in so doing to become aware as well of some significant differences.[77] Sextus is actually called *amans* 'lover' at 2.805, and like the typical elegiac lover he is deeply affected by *amor* (passion, which takes the form of fire and madness), is greatly attracted by a girl (by her beauty, pale complexion and blonde hair),[78] approaches her at night and is daring in his pursuit of furtive love,[79] tries to win her over by means of entreaties and threats[80] and has a 'rival' (Collatinus).[81] However, this 'rival' is a kinsman and colleague of Sextus, and the prince's 'beloved' is a respectable and happily married woman whose strong and genuine love for her husband he had recently seen. And this 'lover' (a married man) uses far more drastic threats than are ever employed in love elegy, and when they do not work will not take No for an answer and proceeds to a callous rape, which leads eventually to Lucretia's death. So too, unlike the lover of Latin elegy, Sextus is not harmless, appealing (even comical), tender, unmanly, unwarlike and under the thumb of the girl. By means of all of this Ovid makes Sextus seem even darker and more brutal and shows him as perverting and debasing normal love as found in prior elegiac poetry.

---

[74] The verbs appear in 780, 784, 787, 793, 794, 795, 805, 806 and 811.

[75] At 2.785.

[76] In 2.762, 769, 779, and 788.

[77] NEWLANDS 149f. and FOX 212ff. also see echoes of erotic elegy here, but miss the point.

[78] At 2.763. Cf. e.g. *A.A.* 1.614, 3.535.

[79] See 2.781–3 and cf. especially *A.A.* 1.608.

[80] At 2.805f. Cf. e.g. Tib.1.6.55f., 77ff., Prop. 3.24.

[81] As Sextus is here a soldier undertaking a sort of erotic campaign there may be play with *militia amoris* (on which see MURGATROYD 1975), and his offering of a bribe at 2.805f. and his golden scabbard at 2.793 may allude to the hated *dives amator* ('rich lover') of elegy.

CHAPTER SIX

OVID AND LIVY

The relationship between Ovid and Livy in the *Fasti* is not as varied and complex as that between Ovid and Virgil, but it is still important and well worth studying. Such a study reveals more about Ovid's engagement with preceding literature and about his narrative techniques in the poem, and the Livian perspective sharpens the focus and is vital for informed appreciation of all thirty-one narratives in the poem on Rome's origins and early years,[1] of four of them in particular. Research has already been done on the poet's allusions to the historian, establishing numerous similarities and some minor differences in individual passages,[2] but this will be the first analysis to address major issues and present a broad picture, discussing departures from Livy at length. Overall it seems that in the *Fasti* Ovid is reclaiming these myths and legends for verse and is responding to Livy the sober, moralistic historian (as a tempting target) and to Livy the accomplished story-teller (as a challenge). So Ovid puts the poetry and marvel back into these tales (with poetic language, figures and word order, with divine interventions and so on), eschews Livy's manner (the solemnity, judicious caution, full and detailed treatment, ethical purpose, annalistic narrative and so forth) and also tries to improve on Livy's stories as stories (making them livelier, snappier, darker etc., and sometimes mischievously out-Livying Livy).

The resulting product has little historical value and is certainly open to censure as sheer entertainment, manifestly fanciful and fabricated, and lacking any real depth or breadth of vision. Then again Ovid was a poet, not a historian, and he had an outlook and interests that were generally at variance with Livy's, and with the *Fasti* he was producing a quite dissimilar type of literary composition. This chapter does not try to argue that one of these authors is better than the other. They are just different.

---

[1] 1.259ff., 469ff., 543ff., 2.195ff., 361ff., 383ff., 429ff., 481ff., 585ff., 687ff., 711ff., 3.11ff., 49ff., 179ff., 277ff., 545ff., 663ff., 677ff., 4.249ff., 641ff., 809ff., 879ff., 5.451ff., 639ff., 6.105ff., 131ff., 351ff., 419ff., 485ff., 587ff., 657ff.

[2] See SCHENKL, SOFER, MARCHESI, HEINZE 340ff. and BÖMER I 26f.

Part 1: The General Picture

The passages on the Fabii, Gabii, Lucretia and Tullia (discussed below), which contain extensive Livian influence, and also brief echoes of the historian throughout the *Fasti* make it clear that Ovid was acquainted with Livy's depiction of early Rome and its antecedents.[3] So in constructing his own depiction in those four passages and elsewhere obviously he will have had Livy in mind, and in fact Ovid has much in common with him. So too where there are substantial deviations from Livy in those four passages and elsewhere we can reasonably assume that at least in part Ovid was reacting against his predecessor (and other historians), and that he also had rather different ideas of his own about what that ancient world might have been like and how it should be approached, employed and presented.

Nature of the World Depicted

The divine and the marvellous in the world of early Rome and its antecedents are much more prominent in the *Fasti*[4] than they are in Livy (who generally avoids miracles and direct intervention of the gods).[5] This is part of the process of 'remythologization',[6] and as a result Ovid portrays a lively, colourful and unpredictable world of wonder. It is filled with (fully anthropomorphic) gods as well as men, and these divinities constantly step in as major figures doing very important things, especially to ensure the creation and survival of Rome (fathering Romulus, saving the city from the Sabines and the Gauls, from crop failure and barrenness of Roman wives etc.).[7] We find the full paraphernalia of divine opponents (Juno and Janus at 1.259ff.), deities conversing with mortals (e.g. Jupiter talking to Numa at 3.333ff.) and councils in heaven (as at 6.353ff., where the gods discuss the siege of the Capitol). There are numinous touches, such as ancient and sacred groves, and the hedges trembling before the appearance of Quirinus at 2.501. There is lurid horror too (Cacus, the fire-breathing monster, at 1.551ff. and the vampire-like screech-owls at 6.131ff.). But, typically for Ovid, there is also humour in this connection—Jupiter frustrated by Juturna and reduced to making embarrassing overtures to the other nymphs; Mars tricked by Anna into believing that he actually had an assignation with Minerva; and Faunus and Picus drinking too much wine, passing out and being shackled by a human (2.585ff., 3.295ff., 677ff.).

---

[3] In connection with Livy's depiction particularly helpful are OGILVIE, LUCE 230–49, LIPOVSKY, PHILLIPS, MILES, FOX 96ff., OAKLEY and FORSYTHE.

[4] In only five out of the thirty-one stories are there no intervening deities and no miraculous items (2.361ff., 687ff., 3.663ff., 5.639ff. and 6.657ff.).

[5] See WALSH 47f.

[6] Compare Virgil's 'remythologization' in the *Georgics* after Lucretius' demythologization (see GALE 113ff.)

[7] Livy occasionally touches on support for Rome from fate and the gods (e.g. 1.4.1, 46.5, 48.7), but Ovid takes this much further and has heaven intricately and continually bound up with the city.

Another noteworthy aspect is the different emphasis on events prior to the founding of Rome. Livy viewed such material as embellished by *poeticis . . . fabulis* 'poetic stories' rather than based on historical fact, included it as a way of elevating Rome's origins but did not attach much importance to it (*praefatio* 6–9). He played it down in his writing: it figures in only four (1.1, 2, 3, 7) out of the sixty chapters in book one down to the fall of the monarchy, and so occupies about one fifteenth of the total. By way of contrast Ovid played it up (perhaps specifically because Livy decried it on account of the poetic stories): it is present in nine of the twenty-five passages in the *Fasti* down to the end of the kings,[8] and so takes up about one third of the total. Given the nature of these tales, Ovid thereby increased the picturesqueness and vivacity (if not the veracity) of his world of Rome's beginnings. He also made it more varied and wide-ranging: whereas Livy (apart from Cacus in 1.7) was tightly focused on Romulus' ancestors, Ovid went much further afield, including also the tales of how Juturna eluded Jupiter's amatory advances and Lara was deprived of her tongue and raped, how Anna became a nymph and fooled Mars, and how Cranae was raped and warded off the screech-owls from Proca.

Approach and Usage

Livy's attitude to these early Roman and pre-Roman myths and legends is essentially serious. He has a measure of respect for them—hence he records them, even though he cannot vouch for their truthfulness, doing this especially because they add dignity to Rome's beginnings. His responsible and respectable approach means that there is little that is lightweight or humorous in his narrative, with episodes such as the rapes of Rhea Silvia and the Sabine Women given a brief and sober treatment, and more grave material receiving the stress. Livy also uses the stories in essentially serious ways—to convey information, to edify by means of positive or negative examples, to celebrate early Roman virtues and achievements etc.[9] and also to appeal to readers, so that the historical, ethical and patriotic aspects will be more palatable and effective.

---

[8] 1.469ff., 543ff., 2.585ff., 3.545ff., 677ff., 4.879ff., 6.105ff., 131ff. and 485ff.

Ovid is more flexible and generally less earnest in his attitude to and employment of these tales. He too can take a serious approach (as we will see below with the Fabii, Lucretia and Tullia), and he obviously has affection for the stories (telling so many of them, some at length). But in place of respect he often shows levity, in parts of accounts and throughout them. These narratives can be quaint (the loaves raining down on the Gauls thanks to Baker Jupiter at 6.351ff.), farcical (Cranae tricking those who proposition her at 6.105ff.), risqué (various rapes) and irreverent towards heroes (like Evander: see pp. 34ff.), heroines (Rhea Silvia at 3.11ff. being raped in her sleep and later waking up tired and having no idea why) and divinities (e.g. Mars made a fool of by Anna at 3.677ff.). As for usage, information is conveyed, but there is rather less glorification of Rome and no moral improvement at all (although piquantly Ovid's Fabii and Tullia, if so employed, would constitute even stronger positive and negative exemplars than they do in Livy: see further below). Instead there is much more appeal to readers, but with the intention of entertaining them in various ways (rather than anything weightier). So, for instance, there is skilfulness (as with the elegant and effective structure of the double rape at 2.585ff.: see pp. 71ff.), wit (giving Janus the first narrative in the *Fasti* at 1.259ff.), literary play (with Virgil's Juturna at 2.585ff.: see pp. 89ff., 109 and 132f.) and various kinds of sport with the reader, such as deception and mystification (see pp. 227ff.).

Romulus is a good illustration of the above observations. Livy's stance is always serious, and he makes Romulus the protagonist in the narrative from 1.4 to 1.16. Overall the historian is admiring and respectful, and he depicts Romulus as a great fighter but also a shrewd statesman who fostered and developed the Rome that he founded.[10]

---

[9] Cf. e.g. LUCE 230ff., WALSH 66ff., 82ff., OAKLEY 115ff.

[10] See e.g. 1.4.9, 1.5.7, 1.8.1f., 6f., 1.9.14, 1.10.4 and especially the overall assessment at 1.15.6ff.

But Livy does also show reserve about Romulus' supposed divinity and the miraculous elements in the tradition, and he does assign a few faults to him, especially in connection with the murder of Remus,[11] so that his Romulus is a more realistic and three-dimensional character.

Romulus in Ovid is essentially the same figure; the difference lies in the treatment of him. Ovid is flippant in connection with Rome's first king at least as often as he is serious (and the latter tone tends to be subverted by the former). At 2.361ff. and 383ff. frivolity is not in evidence, but at 4.809ff. and 5.451ff. the surface solemnity is undermined somewhat by the tantalizing over the trustworthiness of the narrators (see pp. 44f. and 55f.). Elsewhere Ovid has real fun in connection with Rome's revered founder. At 3.11ff., of Romulus' conception, Mars appears as a fast worker and very aroused lover, while Rhea Silvia sleeps through the rape and subsequently awakes in blissful ignorance of it. At 3.49ff., on Romulus' early years, there is an elaborate tease over the relevance of the narrative (see pp. 278ff.). At 2.429ff. the king actually regrets carrying off the Sabine women when they ruin the whole point of the Rape by proving largely incapable of bearing children, and there is a startling oracle at 441 which seems to order the wives to copulate with a goat. At 3.199f. Mars high-handedly postpones Ovid's narration of the Rape of the Sabine Women, and at 3.215ff. the war god of all people dwells affectionately on the peaceful conclusion to the fighting with the aggrieved Sabines and the use of shields by them to carry their grandsons.

On several occasions the poet minimizes the king's role in contrast to (perhaps in deliberate reaction to) the respectful prominence given to him by Livy. So Romulus is a minor player in connection with the infertility of the Roman wives at 2.429ff., his wife overshadows him at 3.205ff. with her proposal for ending the fighting with the Sabines, and Remus steals the spotlight from him for a change at 2.361ff., where Remus is the one who defeats the robbers, and at 5.451ff., where he returns as a ghost and dominates the passage. None of these stories appears in Livy.

Ovid puts the divine and the marvellous back in (Mars as father, the wolf and woodpecker nurturing the twins, the apotheosis of Romulus), but at the same time, playfully, and blithely making use of the king just as suits his purpose on each occasion, he can be irreverent (as will be clear from the above) and he makes Romulus in some respects rather less admirable than he is in Livy, most notably outside of the legendary and mythical narratives (at 1.29ff. Ovid gently mocks his naivety in connection with the calendar, and at 2.131ff. he belittles him extensively in contrast with Augustus).[12]

---

[11] Cf. OGILVIE 54, HERBERT-BROWN 1994 50, FOX 109ff. and MILES 137ff.

Sometimes too Ovid offers what seems to be a new take on the old tales, providing perspectives which are not found in Livy and which may represent conscious modifications of Livy's account. So, for instance, at 2.393ff. we are made privy to the varied emotions of one of the servants sent to expose the twins; at 2.481ff. and 3.179ff. we are shown Mars' love for and pride in his son Romulus; and at 5.457ff. Remus (returned as a ghost) is made into a real character with distinct feelings, and the tragedy of his murder and the losses that it meant for him are brought out fully.

Methods of Narration

One striking difference between the narratives of Livy and Ovid is the general absence in the latter of expressions of scepticism about the stories of Rome's origins and early era. The historian is properly cautious about accepting the tradition, frequently qualifies with terms such as *dicunt* ('they say') and *fertur* ('it is related') and also brings in and weighs up rival versions and theories.[13] The poet for the most part eagerly embraces the tales, presents them without any reservation and ignores controversy, thereby achieving more narrative drive and presenting an uncomplicated picture free from prosaic misgivings and uncertainty. In all of the thirty-one passages Ovid only adds remarks such as *dicunt* ('they say') to his statements nine times.[14] Those nine cases could be (at least in part) parody of the historian's qualifications (especially because Ovid elsewhere lets by without any hesitation even more questionable items and most of the very material which Livy carefully qualifies); and Ovid could be guying his predecessor's scepticism by affirming the truth of his accounts at several points.[15] Alternatives are only offered in connection with the name of a grove at 6.503 and the provenance of Anna Perenna at 3.543ff. and 663ff. And in the latter instance, after a long passage authoritatively identifying the goddess with Dido's sister Anna, Ovid impishly maintains at 3.662 that his second explanation (that she was an old woman of Bovillae) is not far from what can be taken to be true. Of course, as an intelligent man Ovid realized that the tradition was unreliable, but rather than clogging up his narrative with qualifying comments, competing versions and disputation, he played subtle games like this and conveyed uncertainty in a crafty and unobtrusive way, by undermining the trustworthiness of his inspirers and narrators (see pp. 36f., 44f. and 55f.).

---

[12] See further WALLACE-HADRILL 228, FOX 186ff. and HINDS 1992 117ff. Hinds claims there that Ovid's Romulus is uncompromisingly warlike in contradistinction to the religious and peaceful Numa, and BOYLE-WOODARD xl describe the poet's Romulus as a thug who manifests values quite other than those of the priest-king and civilizer Numa, founder of Rome's religion. But their case is overstated and lacking in balance. Romulus presumably acquiesced in the truce with the Sabines at 3.215ff., Mars was the real one behind the Rape of the Sabines according to 3.197f., and in the *Fasti* Romulus often appears in a non-martial role. In particular he is a statesman who organizes the Roman people, senators etc. at 3.127ff., 5.71f. and 6.83ff.; he is a lawgiver at 2.492 and 3.62; and he is pious and involved in rites at 2.361ff., 3.73ff., 4.819ff. and 5.47. And Romulus is actually bracketed with Numa, as a worshipper of Maiestas, at 5.47f., and did, of course, become a god himself.

[13] Cf. FOX 98ff., FORSYTHE 40ff. and 87ff.

That brings us to another marked difference. Livy is always the narrator, telling these stories himself or personally reporting accounts in his authorities, all in a very straightforward fashion. Ovid on the other hand gets additional interest, point, humour, pathos and so on by having people other than himself actually narrate or inspire the tales. So, for example, comedy is achieved via Carmentis at 1.469ff. and poignancy via Egeria at 3.277ff. (see pp. 34ff. and 39ff.).

Ovid is much more prone to assign (vivid and immediate) direct speech to his characters than Livy is. The poet usually avoids the long speeches found in Livy that hold up the action, going instead for shorter and snappier snatches of monologue or dialogue, and in particular he shuns extensive direct or indirect statement clarifying motives, issues etc. of the kind favoured by the historian. Also, in place of the plain and detached narration of events that is standard in Livy, Ovid opts for a more involved and involving style. So there are asides, which can establish intimacy with the reader, or heighten the impact, or have a humorous effect.[16] There are also dramatic interjections and exclamations, rhetorical questions to make us empathize, and engaging addresses to the reader.[17] Ovid also represents himself as so carried away that he apostrophises characters in the passages, asking them questions, remonstrating with them and issuing commands to them.[18] There are also lively and startling addresses to characters external to the narrative (like Ilia at 2.598), to things in the story (the Circus Maximus at 2.392), to the person who is actually supposed to be inspiring an account (Bacchus at 6.486) and even to Ovid himself (as the narratee, i.e. the one to whom the tale is being narrated, at 3.179, 184, 199f. and 5.643).

---

[14] At 2.203, 238, 3.45, 4.258, 6.137, 167, 421, 504 and 614.

[15] At 3.47, 53, 329, 370, 4.326, 6.609 and 612.

[16] See e.g. 6.423f.; 2.413, 4.326; 3.11, 5.646.

In Livy's annalistic history these stories are usually presented in chronological order and at length, and they form part of one long and continuous narrative, so that one comes away from him with a sense of massiveness and full and disciplined coverage. In Ovid's *Fasti*, largely due to the nature of the poem, they are discrete and make scattered and mostly brief appearances; and the chronology is jumbled, from the start (Ovid begins with Janus saving Rome from Tarpeia's treachery at 1.259ff., but next moves on to the much earlier Carmentis at 1.469ff.). Ovid is also prepared to mix together quite separate incidents: the arrival in Italy of Evander and Carmentis (1.469ff.) is succeeded without a break by the combat with Cacus (1.543ff.); and at 2.687ff. and 711ff. the capture of Gabii, the oracle of Apollo and the rape of Lucretia all form part of one sequence.

For individual tales Livy, who has a historian's aims, typically presents a detailed narrative with well defined stages (in actual order of occurrence) and a distinct beginning, middle and end, providing context and overview, analysing strategy, causes, outcomes etc., and clarifying points of topography, local custom and so on.[19] Ovid, who has an interest in story rather than history and who is also influenced by the demands of his poem, is much less orderly and much less obvious than that, preferring to do unexpected and quite dazzling things with narrative. He eschews such background, surveys, analysis and clarification,[20] and also drops much of the facts and figures that make for a fuller picture (terms of treaties, legal formulae, numbers of dead etc.), in favour of a leaner, more action-based account. Ovid has streamlined versions of events handled at length by Livy: he covers the exposure of Romulus and Remus down to the founding of Rome at 3.49–78 (Livy takes four chapters over all this: 1.4–7); and he moves from the shortage of females in Rome causing the Rape of the Sabine Women down to the end of the fighting between the Romans and the vengeful Sabines at 3.179–228 (all of which occupies five chapters in Livy: 1.9–13).[21] Of course, it is the reporting of earlier authors such as Livy that facilitates such compression. Sometimes Ovid selects for narration just one (significant, dramatic, marvellous etc.) incident from a larger sequence, such as Tarpeia's betrayal from the war with the Sabines (1.259ff.) and Baker Jupiter's intervention in the capture of Rome and siege of the Capitol (6.351ff.). He misses out important parts of a story that he is telling too: e.g. at 3.179ff. he omits the actual Rape of the Sabine Women (which is amusingly postponed until later in the *Fasti* by the narrator Mars); and at 2.383ff. in connection with the exposure of Romulus and Remus he does not include the intervention of Faustulus and Larentia (he only goes as far as the *lupa* 'wolf' because he is explaining the origin of the name of the Lupercal). Ovid also separates and disperses bits from the same story, resuming later in the poem. For instance, the battle between Hercules and Cacus is recounted at 1.543ff., but is then picked up again at 5.639ff. (on Hercules' companions at that time), and also at 6.519ff. (about Hercules' help to Ino then); and the life of Romulus is broken up into a series of separate episodes scattered throughout the six books and presented out of chronological sequence rather than being given in one unbroken narrative (as in Livy).[22] Finally, Ovid even retells the same episode, dexterously ensuring differences of tone, time, focus and viewpoint. He recounts the birth, exposure and rescue of Romulus and Remus three times in the *Fasti*. Firstly, 2.383ff. is a serious passage, in which a servant taking them to the Tiber speaks and gives his perspective, and there is concentration on the servant and the twins during the exposure. Then there is the largely humorous 3.11ff., where Rhea

---

[17] As at 2.219, 408, 711, 739, 789, 835; 2.801ff.; 2.202, 391, 405, 419.

[18] See e.g. 2.225f., 386, 794, 811f., 6.123ff.

[19] Cf. WALSH 177ff., 189f., 197ff., OAKLEY 125ff.

[20] The omissions are especially noticeable in connection with Tarpeia at 1.259ff., the Fabii at 2.195ff. and the oracle at 2.711ff.

---

[21] Then again, being Ovid, he is also capable of providing extensive treatment of characters and episodes mentioned only briefly in the historian, such as Carmentis (1.469ff.) and the rape of Rhea Silvia (3.11ff.).

[22] On the fragmentation of Romulus' story cf. p. 147 and Miller in BOYD 2002 185.

Silvia speaks and shows her outlook, and she is the one highlighted, during the conception. Lastly at 3.49ff. (lines which blend humour[23] with the predominant seriousness) we are given the point of view of Romulus (who speaks) and his brother at 63ff. and 73ff., and the main stress is shifted to the twins' career after their rescue.

Part 2: Individual Narratives

Four passages in the *Fasti* (2.195ff., 2.687ff., 2.711ff., 6.587ff.) evince a more palpable and specific reaction to Livy. The major and most striking aspect of the poet's engagement with the historian is what we may term 'renarration', i.e. the process whereby an author retells essentially the same story that a predecessor told, sticking very closely to the main outline, keeping the same characters, events and order of events, and repeating exactly or almost exactly many details and words, but still making some significant changes largely or entirely of his own (as far as we can tell).[24] Somewhat akin to amoebean poetry,[25] such renarration is rather unusual (something of an Ovidian speciality)[26] and has been largely ignored by intertextual critics and conventional philologists, so that we will be breaking some new ground here. In the four passages in question Ovid follows Livy so faithfully in the main and parades so many clear allusions of various kinds to him that one cannot help but think of Livy's stories, but at the same time one also cannot miss the modifications that the poet makes to his source, utilizing the methods noted in Part 1 above

---

[23] E.g. in the tease over the relevance of these verses (on which see pp. 278ff.).

[24] It is in the light of these (to all intents and purposes) predominantly personal alterations by the imitator that I distinguish renarration from *contaminatio* (the blending of two or more external sources), as found for example at 1.543ff. (the fight with Cacus). Versions in Greek sources are nothing like as close to these four Ovidian passages as Livy is.

[25] In that a second speaker picks up the subject matter of the first, uses the same metre and number of lines and even some of the same language, and tries to cap the initial speaker. Cf. e.g. Theoc. *Id.* 5.80ff., Catullus 45, Virgil *Ecl.* 7.21ff., Hor. *C.* 3.9.

[26] Compare the doublets in connection with the abduction of Hylas in Theoc. *Id.* 13 and Ap. Rhod. 1.1207ff. (although it is not clear who is the one renarrating there) and Ovid's own retelling of myths such as the rapes of Callisto, Persephone and Europa in the *Fasti* (2.155ff., 4.419ff., 5.605ff.) and *Met.* (2.409ff., 5.835ff., 2.836ff.). For Ovid's handling of episodes in the *Aeneid* see pp. 126ff. Outside of narrative something similar happens in Alcaeus 347 PLF, Catullus 51, Ovid *A.A.*1.135ff. and Roman Comedy.

(simplification, condensation, remythologization etc.), and also altering structure, tone, characterization and so forth. In fact over the course of the four accounts Ovid displays a variety of techniques of renarration in what amounts to an impressive show of dexterity and versatility as he does different things with different tales (the most notable examples of the main techniques will be highlighted below). There is, of course, an element of *aemulatio* (rivalry) in all this, and in particular Ovid tries to out-Livy Livy (his Fabii are more stirring heroes, his story of Gabii is even more compressed, his Lucretia is more pathetic, his Tullia is more of a negative role-model). Whether or not he succeeds overall in topping Livy is largely a matter of personal taste. Some might see retroactive intertextuality here[27] and take the line that they could not read the historian in the same light again after the poet's versions (feeling that Livy's chapters on the Fabii are rather ungenerous, his account of the fall of Gabii is somewhat pedestrian, his presentation of the rape of Lucretia is not sombre enough, and his version of Tullia's story does not have as powerful a climax as it might have). Then again others might criticize Ovid's narratives for lacking background and concrete detail, and for being theatrical, sentimental and lightweight.[28]

The Fabii

In the early years of the republic the Roman clan called the Fabii undertook to defend Rome all on their own against raids by the men of the Etruscan town of Veii. After initial successes the Fabii were annihilated in an enemy ambush in 477 BC. At *Fasti* 2.195ff., which is clearly a renarration of Livy 2.48ff.,[29] Ovid tells the tale as follows:

> haec fuit illa dies in qua Veientibus armis 195
>   ter centum Fabii ter cecidere duo.
> una domus vires et onus susceperat urbis:
>   sumunt gentiles arma professa manus.

---

[27] On which cf. HINDS 1998 99ff. and EDMUNDS 159ff.

[28] Cf. e.g. MARCHESI.

[29] Renarration is evident in the light of substantial and extensive similarities, as at 197 (cf. Livy 2.49.1 *familiam unam subisse civitatis onus* 'one clan took on the burden of the state'), 200 (cf. Livy 2.49.4 *quorum neminem ducem sperneres* 'not one of whom would you have rejected as leader'), 201f. (cf. Livy 2.49.8 (*infelici via, dextro iano portae Carmentalis* 'by an unlucky route, through the right-hand arch of the Carmental gate') and many other points (see further SCHENKL 402, SOFER 5ff., MARCHESI 115ff. and MERLI 1999 72ff.).

egreditur castris miles generosus ab isdem,
e quis dux fieri quilibet aptus erat.
Carmentis portae dextro est via proxima iano:
ire per hanc noli, quisquis es; omen habet.
illa fama refert Fabios exisse trecentos:
porta vacat culpa, sed tamen omen habet.
ut celeri passu Cremeram tetigere rapacem
(turbidus hibernis ille fluebat aquis),
castra loco ponunt: destrictis ensibus ipsi
Tyrrhenum valido Marte per agmen eunt;
non aliter quam cum Libyca de gente leones
invadunt sparsos lata per arva greges.
diffugiunt hostes inhonestaque volnera tergo
accipiunt: Tusco sanguine terra rubet.
sic iterum, sic saepe cadunt; ubi vincere aperte
non datur, insidias armaque tecta parant.
campus erat, campi claudebant ultima colles
silvaque montanas occulere apta feras.
in medio paucos armentaque rara relinquunt,
cetera virgultis abdita turba latet.
ecce velut torrens undis pluvialibus auctus
aut nive, quae Zephyro victa tepente fluit,
per sata perque vias fertur nec, ut ante solebat,
riparum clausas margine finit aquas,
sic Fabii vallem latis discursibus implent,
quodque vident sternunt, nec metus alter inest.
quo ruitis, generosa domus? male creditis hosti:
simplex nobilitas, perfida tela cave.
fraude perit virtus: in apertos undique campos
prosiliunt hostes et latus omne tenent.
quid faciant pauci contra tot milia fortes?
quidve, quod in misero tempore restet, adest?
sicut aper longe silvis latratibus actus
fulmineo celeres dissipat ore canes,
mox tamen ipse perit, sic non moriuntur inulti,
volneraque alterna dantque feruntque manu.
una dies Fabios ad bellum miserat omnes,
ad bellum missos perdidit una dies.
ut tamen Herculeae superessent semina gentis,
credibile est ipsos consuluisse deos:
nam puer impubes et adhuc non utilis armis
unus de Fabia gente relictus erat;
scilicet ut posses olim tu, Maxime, nasci,
cui res cunctando restituenda foret.

This was the day on which Veientine weapons killed three hundred and six Fabii. A single family had undertaken the burden of defending the city, and that clan took up arms, as promised. From the same

> camp out marched the noble soldiers, any one of whom was fit to be their leader. The nearest route was through the right-hand arch of Carmentis' gate; don't pass through that, whoever you are: it is ill-omened. They say that the three hundred Fabii went that way; the gate is blameless, but still it is ill-omened. They quickly reached the sweeping Cremera (which was swirling along on account of winter rains) and pitched camp there. With drawn swords they break through the Etruscan troops in a vigorous onslaught, as when lions of Libyan breed attack herds widely scattered across the countryside. The enemy flee in different directions and are wounded dishonourably in the back. They fell like this again and again. When they could not win in the open, they prepared an ambush with armed men in concealment. There was a plain, and the ends of the plain were enclosed by hills and a wood thick enough to hide animals of the mountains. In the middle they left a few men and cattle spread out; the rest of their force was lying low in the undergrowth out of sight. Lo and behold, just as a torrent, swollen by rainfall or snow melted by the warm west wind, is borne along over crops and over roads and does not (as before) keep its water confined within the bounds of its banks, so the Fabii charge far and wide all over the valley, felling everything in sight, with no fear for anything else. Where are you rushing, you high-born/noble-spirited clan? Ingenuous nobles, be on your guard against treacherous weapons! Deceit destroys courage: from every side the enemy leap out into the open plain and occupy the ground all around them. What are these brave few to do against so many thousands? What remaining course of action is there in such dismal circumstances? Just as a boar, driven far from/in the woods by barking, scatters the swift hounds with its lightning-fast snout but soon dies itself, so they are not killed with impunity but inflict and receive wounds in turn. A single day had dispatched all the Fabii to war, a single day destroyed those dispatched to war. But it is plausible that the gods themselves took steps to ensure that the seed of this family descended from Hercules might survive. For alone out of the Fabian family a boy below the age of puberty and not capable of fighting had been left behind/was left as a survivor, obviously so that you could be born one day, Maximus, to save the state by delaying.

The elegant and effective organization of material represents one of the major departures from Livy, who begins halfway through a chapter and relates a crowded series of events and various ups and downs without much attention to structure. Ovid, on the other hand, has a careful preamble at 195f., and then splits the (simplified) action into three parts by means of three similes which are linked to each other[30] and which conclude each section, and finally adds a conclusion

---

[30] All three are connected with fighting, are set in the country and have multiple

at 235ff. In the first segment of the action (197–210) the Fabii arrive and attack, in the second (211–224) we see their initial successes, and in the third (225–234) we witness their final defeat. Here the bright centre piece stands out against a darker frame (the defeat at 225ff. and the emphasis on gloom at 202 and 204). The preamble (with its death and defeat) is also sombre, but is offset by the conclusion's positive 237ff. (with survival and victory), which makes for an upbeat ending to this tale of disaster. There is also ring composition: lines 195–6 are recalled at 235f. (with *dies* 'day' and *Fabii* echoed) and also at 239 (*armis* at the end of the hexameter each time).

The similes constitute another marked divergence from Livy 2.48ff. (where there are no similes at all) and an effective addition, with several other aspects in addition to their structural role. For a start the imagery is densely suggestive. So 209f. economically conjure up a dramatic scene of panic, flight and carnage, the sudden onset of a body of fierce and irresistible predators, easily penetrating the ranks of spiritless and undisciplined victims. At 219ff. one thinks primarily of the Fabii ranging far and wide and wreaking havoc, and of the enemy (like the land) being swamped, immobile and helpless; but, of course, there is also land beyond the flood (like the hidden Veientines); and the lines also intimate that the Romans are swollen with confidence, out of control, unthinking and possessed of a power that is great but not lasting (the flood will eventually abate).[31] In place of lengthy description of the final fighting (as in Livy), 231ff. concisely suggest a loud, bloody and furious end, with the Fabii hopelessly outnumbered but still formidable, and selling their lives dearly, scattering and maiming even then enemies who are working together and making swift and relentless onslaughts from all sides. In addition to these numerous implications, the similes catch three important moments—when the Fabii make their first attack, when they enter the trap, and when they are killed—and they chart the decline of the clan, who from being lions attacking scattered herds become a flood (of great but

---

correspondences. The first and second ones illustrate destructive activity over a broad area. In the first and third the Fabii are likened to wild animals in combat with other animals. In the second and third there is movement over a distance and violent but transitory activity by the torrent and the boar. The trio stand out because of the general rarity of similes in the *Fasti* (cf. p. 23).

[31] This is an aptly sprawling simile, and there is subtle point in the comparison to the torrent in view of the swollen Cremera where the Fabii have their camp (205ff.). Note also the forest link in the third simile (231 and 216).

ephemeral strength) and finally a single boar, itself attacked and killed by the concerted efforts of a pack of hounds. The imagery increases the emotional impact of the passage as well: 209f. accentuate the admirable and glorious ferocity of the Romans, and the despicable feebleness of the enemy; at 219ff. there is ominous foreboding (in view of the torrent's lack of control etc.); and at 231ff. the boar's desperate bravery and death arouse both sadness and respect. The comparisons also give the Fabii prominence and an aura of specialness: they are the sole characters in the *Fasti* to have a full three similes applied to them, no other narrative contains as many as three such comparisons (in fact there are only ten similes in the whole six books), and 219ff. and 231ff. are the only similes in the poem which extend over a couplet.

The imagery also plays a part in the third major difference from Livy—the raised (epic) tone. The presence of as many as three similes in a fairly short passage of military narrative, the length of the images (especially 219ff. and 231ff.) and the fact that there are parallels for each of them in Homer and Virgil[32] mean that Ovid's lines have a flavour of epic poetry. Phraseology from Ennius and the *Aeneid* appears at various points as well. Scholars have already commented on the Ennian and Virgilian provenance of *celeri passu* (205), *de gente* (209), *sanguine terra rubet* (212), *moriuntur inulti* (233) and all of 242.[33] In addition, *Libycus* is only applied to *gens* at *Aeneid* 4.320 before *Fasti* 2.209; *lata arva* (as in 2.210) is only found before Ovid at *Aeneid* 8.605; and the only instance of *Tusco sanguine* prior to line 212 in our passage is at *Aeneid* 10.203. On top of that there is Ovid's ending. At 237ff. he remythologizes (via Hercules and the gods) at the same time as including language and details from Livy 2.50.11. The historian there spoke of one (*unum*) of the Fabii surviving to become a very great help (*maximum futurum auxilium*) to the Roman people and had in mind the Quintus Fabius of 3.9 who became consul a few years later. Ovid improves on that and neatly plays on Livy's *maximum* with his *Maxime* (referring to a much more important Fabius—Quintus Fabius Maximus Cunctator, who successfully employed delaying tactics against Hannibal, avoiding open battle with Rome's great enemy). At the same time, with great sleight of hand, Ovid with his *unus* in 240 combines allusion to Livy's *unum* ('one') and also to *unus* (meaning 'alone') in a line of Virgil. At *Aeneid* 6.845f. Anchises in the Underworld addresses one of the souls of the future heroes of Rome, saying: *tu Maximus ille es,/ unus qui nobis cunctando restituis rem* ('you are the famous Maximus, who alone by delaying save the state for us'). Virgil there was virtually quoting a line from Ennius *Annals* 370 (*unus homo nobis cunctando restituit rem* 'one man who by delaying saves the state for us'). That Ovid in 241f. had Virgil primarily in mind is shown by Ovid's address to Maximus (still to be born), use of the relative clause and placement of *tu, Maxime*, in the same position in the hexameter (points common to Virgil but not to Ennius), but of course the Ennian allusion is still clear beneath the surface. So Ovid closes this renarration with a final flourish that stresses its raised tone by means of a double dose of epic in one climactic line.

---

[32] See FRAZER II 324, BÖMER II 97f., MERLI 1999 and 2000 204ff., and cf. also Hom. *Il.* 13.471ff., 16.352ff.

[33] See BÖMER II 97–9, MERLI 1999 74 and 2000 208, 214.

That lofty flavour has a bearing on the fourth substantial deviation from Livy—the enhanced (heroic) status of the Fabii in the *Fasti*. The epic diction (intimating an epic adventure) and the imagery (placing the Romans on a par with Hector and other great warriors) obviously build them up, and so do many other things.[34] An episode that extends over two years in Livy seems to occupy a much shorter period in Ovid, so that his Fabii appear more dashing. With regard to particulars, at 195f. Ovid (unlike Livy) begins with the great sacrifice of the family, putting it at the very start for emphasis. Then, omitting the careful scene-setting at Livy 2.48f., Ovid gets his (seemingly more eager and aggressive) Fabii to the Cremera quickly, in 205. At 207–13, instead of just dealing with plundering raids (as in Livy), the Fabii immediately and repeatedly inflict major defeats on the men of Veii. The historian next (2.49.10ff.) has the Veientines with an army from Etruria attack the Fabii's post on the Cremera, until they are driven off by vigorous Roman legions under Lucius Aemilius. Ovid drops this incident totally, so that his (tough and independent) Fabii are in no need of help and are not thrown into the shade at all (regardless of historical accuracy). As for the ambush, in Livy (with better psychology) the clan are manipulated by the enemy and gradually lulled by a series of easy victories into rashness and arrogance (believing themselves invincible). Ovid, on the other hand, while allowing that they are naive in the face of enemy perfidy, does not depict them as manipulated or arrogant and makes a point of openly remarking on their nobility (of birth and spirit) and bravery at this stage (225–227). So too, when the ambush is sprung, the Fabii in the *Fasti* do not show the fear that they do in Livy (twice: at 2.50.7 and 10). Finally, the poet concludes his version at 237ff. by intimating that his Fabii (like the heroes of myth) were the favourites of heaven, and by alluding to their illustrious ancestry (Hercules) and posterity (Maximus).[35]

---

[34] Cf. HEINZE 340 and MERLI 1999 73 and 2000 231ff. for a few points in this connection.

Gabii

At 2.687ff. Ovid recounts how Tarquinius Superbus captured the neighbouring town of Gabii: his son Sextus won the confidence of the townspeople and then asked his father via a messenger how to destroy Gabii; when the messenger reported back that Tarquinius had not spoken but had mowed down the tallest lilies in his garden with his staff, Sextus saw the point, promptly killed the leading men of Gabii and handed over the defenceless town (for text and translation see pp. 229f.). Ovid here is retelling a tale found in Livy 1.53–4[36] and displaying some different techniques of renarration.

---

[35] HARRIES 1991 154ff. (followed by NEWLANDS 90f.) would dispute the heroism of Ovid's Fabii. Apart from all the points just made by me in the main text (which render their heroic status perfectly obvious to me), note that (i) I fail to perceive any discordant effects at 202 and 204, dismantling the epic tone of the immediately preceding hexameters; (ii) I grant that Livy depicts the Fabii as over-confident, but do not see that *Ovid* overtly criticizes them for the folly of a headlong dash (and he is positive about them in 225–7); (iii) in view of the abundance of lion and flood similes, and the absence of close verbal connections to Virgil, and the presence of substantial differences of detail, he is surely wrong to tie *Aen.* 9.939ff. to *F.* 2.209f. and *Aen.* 2.304ff. to *F.* 2.219ff. and on the basis of supposed Virgilian allusion to argue against heroic status for the clan in Ovid; (iv) even if *F.* 2.231ff. does look to *Aen.* 10.707ff. (which is not certain, as Virgil's simile develops very differently from Ovid's after *actus aper* in 708), there is no particular reason to read negative connotations into that (Mezentius need be no more than a savage and powerful fighter at bay and perhaps ultimately doomed).

[36] See SCHENKL 404, SOFER 7ff., MARCHESI 171f. and LE BONNIEC 1969 102ff. From among the numerous verbal and thematic echoes cf. e.g. for 688 Livy 1.53.1 (*nec ut iniustus in pace rex, ita dux belli pravus erat* 'although the king was unjust in peace, he was not a bad general in war'), for 690 Livy 1.53.4 (*Gabios . . . minime arte Romana, fraude ac dolo, adgressus est* 'he attacked Gabii by means of deceit and trickery, an un-Roman practice') and for 691 Livy 1.53.5 (*Sextus filius eius, qui minimus ex tribus erat* 'his son Sextus, who was the youngest of the three').

Again, while following Livy very closely in the main, Ovid still makes significant variations. Some of these are major, and some of them are minor. Among the major twists must be included tone and function. In the historian the account of the fall of Gabii is a perfectly straightforward narrative, told with complete seriousness, and it forms a self-contained episode on its own. The poet uses the story to mystify readers as part of a playful puzzle (about its relevance to the Regifugium, mentioned at 2.685) and makes it into a preamble for the rape of Lucretia, to establish an appropriately dark mood, to foreshadow, to introduce relevant themes and so on (see further pp. 230f.).

Another major and obvious difference concerns length. Ovid compresses Livy in all of the four passages studied in Part 2, but in this case the compression is particularly marked. There is also a pawky dexterity to it. Livy's own version was already quite concise (especially when compared to Dio. Hal. 4.53ff.),[37] but here Ovid with typical *aemulatio* (rivalry) takes the concision still further and artfully condenses the condenser (and 2.690 *et Gabios turpi fecerat arte suos* 'and he had made Gabii his by means of a disgraceful trick' could be intended as an early signpost, a knowing nod at what Ovid will be doing here—making Gabii *his* by means of a different kind of *ars*).

While adhering to the main outline of events in his source, Ovid manages to reduce 74 lines of prose (in the Oxford Classical Text) to 24 lines of verse. He achieves this by excising and drastically streamlining. So he dispenses with Tarquinius' unsuccessful initial attacks on Gabii and siege of the town, and also his pretence that he has given up the war and is intent instead on building a temple (to lull the enemy before he sends Sextus to them) at Livy 1.53.4f. Ovid also glides over a large amount of psychologically plausible material in Livy 1.54.1–4 on how Sextus gradually insinuated himself into the confidence of the men of Gabii by speaking in council and fighting the Romans. That section ends with the words *ut non pater Tarquinius potentior Romae quam filius Gabiis esset* ('with the result that the father Tarquinius in Rome was not in a position of greater power than the son was in Gabii'), and slyly Ovid in the process of skimming what precedes those words echoes them (and cuts them down) with his *iamque potens* 'now in a position of power' in 701. In addition, the poet omits the speculation by Livy and the messenger about why

---

[37] Cf. WALSH 179.

Tarquinius did not speak (1.54.6f.) and pares right down to a single line (2.709) the removal of the leading men of Gabii (by execution, banishment and voluntary exile in Livy 1.54.8ff.). While doing away with such (to him) peripheral matter, essentially Ovid selects highlights and strips the story down to three episodes (after a brief introduction at 2.687–90)—Sextus' arrival at Gabii (691–700), the communication with his father via the messenger (701–708) and the fall of Gabii (709–710). Those three groups of lines grow successively shorter and so form a tricolon diminuendo, which makes for a feeling of increasing speed and inexorable progress, while the last section is so curt as to imply a brutally rapid efficiency. So too the brevity of the passage as a whole means that Sextus comes across as more brisk and businesslike than in Livy (if not as calculating and insidious as he is in the historian) and the whole operation seems more slick. Ovid also ensures thereby that his narrative (as well as not overshadowing the subsequent rape of Lucretia) is lean and fast-paced, and that its drama and short, sharp impact are not lessened by diffuse and distracting items (although as a consequence it does also lack elements that a historian would see as being important, such as context, fulness and exactness of detail and probing of motives).

The minor but still significant variations from Livy are modifications of detail and incident. With regard to the former, in Livy 1.54.6 in response to the messenger Tarquin knocks the heads off the poppies in his garden, whereas in *Fasti* 2.703–6 he mows down the tallest lilies, and his garden is actually described in a whole couplet. In both cases the chilling symbolism of the decapitation of the flowers is obvious, but in Ovid the lilies (which are unparalleled in other versions and may well be his own innovation) are a superior symbol. They have more visual appeal (they are taller than poppies and one can picture the heads tumbling down) and they are more specific (the tallest lilies stand for the most eminent men among the mass of citizens). In addition, lilies to many represented the brevity of life, while white had connotations of innocence and purity.[38] Then there is the garden—just a garden in Livy, but in Ovid it is very trim and has fragrant plants and a stream of purling water running through it. Such a setting heightens the brutality of Tarquin's act. It also develops the parallelism with Gabii: one infers that, like the garden, it was an attractive, tranquil and flourishing place, which should have been spared damage, but was barbarously spoiled by Tarquin.

---

[38] See *TLL* III.244.43ff., VII,2. 1399.53ff., *OLD* s.v. *candidus* 8b.

The modified incident is Sextus' arrival at the town. In Livy 1.53.5ff. he turns up at an unspecified time of day and complains at length about his father's cruelty to him, claiming that he has narrowly escaped death, only feels safe with his father's enemies and might even be prepared to fight against Tarquin; and when it seems that he will go elsewhere if they do not take him in, the men of Gabii commiserate and welcome him into their town. Ovid's (much shorter) version is more picturesque and atmospheric, as Sextus there goes one silent night into the midst of the enemy and converses with them as the moon shines down.[39] Ovid also gives Sextus a more dramatic and daring arrival: the darkness makes his approach more hazardous, and the men of Gabii are armed and draw their swords. In place of the long (indirect) speech in Livy, the poet's Sextus comes out with a (direct) speech that is brief, to the point and well aimed. After an arresting opening at 2.693 (where the apparently poor man welcomes death, at the same time as making it clear that he is no threat), in 694 he adds that his father and brothers would like to see him dead (with a convincing touch in the sibling rivalry), and then adds the similarly appalling 695 (he has been cruelly flogged by his own father). Immediately the speech is reinforced by a horrifying visual aid (which is more likely to convince than more words, as in Livy)—the marks of the flogging (and the fact that Sextus endured a whipping to persuade the enemy makes him frighteningly determined and devious).[40] The whole point of the performance is to shock and get sympathy, and it promptly succeeds, as the citizens of Gabii weep (not in Livy) and ask Sextus to help them in their war with Tarquin at once (they only do this later in Livy), making Sextus seem particularly slick and exploitative. Overall, in Ovid the incident has a more concentrated impact and represents Sextus as even more immoral and formidable.

---

[39] So HEINZE 342. Night's darkness has appropriate associations (obscurity, gloom and death).

[40] While improving on Livy with the whipping (which comes from another source: see FRAZER II 503), it looks as if Ovid impudently echoes the historian: Ovid's *crudeli verbere* 'savage flogging' appears to give concrete and memorable form to the vague *crudelibus . . . suppliciis* 'savage torments' in Livy 1.53.8.

Lucretia

When the Romans were besieging the nearby town of Ardea, a contest about their wives arose between Sextus and his companions and at the suggestion of Collatinus they returned home to check on them. His wife alone (Lucretia) was found to be conducting herself properly (spinning among her maids), but Tarquinius Superbus' son Sextus became inflamed with lust for her and later returned and raped her at sword-point. She informed her husband and father before committing suicide, and the famous Brutus was so outraged that he avenged her by driving out the Tarquin dynasty and ending the monarchy at Rome. At 2.711ff. Ovid renarrated the version of this rape and a preceding portent and oracle found at Livy 1.56ff.[41] The major difference this time is that Ovid goes for a much stronger impact on the emotions in his version (and this affective element represents another new aspect of Ovidian renarration). Criticism is divided over whether Ovid succeeds in producing a powerfully moving account or overdoes things, while Livy gets the requisite emotional effect with brevity and dignity.[42] In any case it is interesting and informative to examine the various methods by which Ovid tries for the increased impact, and the most important of these will be considered below.

There is extensive foreshadowing in Ovid's lines, building up a heavy foreboding and heightening the sense of awful inevitability. Absent from Livy, such prefiguring is easy enough to perceive because the story is well known (especially thanks to Livy!) and readers are aware of what is going to happen. Ovid ushers in the rape by means of aptly ominous aperture at 2.711–720, where a snake seizes the sacrificial innards from the burnt out fire on an altar or altars, and this occurrence is described as *nefas visu* 'a horrible sight' (in Livy 1.56.4 the portent consists simply of the appearance of a snake from a wooden pillar and it is not described as a *nefas*). The horrible sight looks forward to the horrible actions to come (compare also *facta nefanda* 'horrible deeds' at 2.850), while the rapacious snake prefigures the rapist Sextus, and the slaughtered victim and extinguished fire anticipate the coming death of Lucretia. In that section Ovid also refers to the initial pretence by Brutus that he was a fool and (unlike Livy) states specifically that he did this *ut esset/ tutus ab insidiis, dire Superbe, tuis* 'to escape a treacherous attack by you, dreadful Superbus' (2.717f.), thereby underlining the treacherous and dreadful nature of the Tarquins that will so soon be in evidence.[43] When he moves on to the rape itself, again Ovid includes precursory details not found in the historian. At 745ff. Lucretia, while spinning, talks to her maids about her husband Collatinus off at the war, not realizing that he has in fact returned with the other Romans. In 752 she complains of him rashly rushing around with a drawn sword not long before the rash Sextus gives her much stronger grounds for complaint by threatening her with a drawn sword prior to raping her (2.793). In 753 she remarks that she loses her mind (*mens abit*) whenever she thinks of her husband fighting the enemy, and then later in 798 she loses her mind (*mens*) when Sextus menaces her with his sword and she cannot think what to do. In 755 she cries for no real reason (not realizing that her husband is in fact present), which foreshadows her later tears (in 820f. and 827) for a very real reason (when recalling the rape). In 753 she also claims that she 'dies' (figuratively) when she thinks of her man fighting, and that line and several others (754, 759, 799f., 814 and 818) are gloomy pointers to her subsequent suicide. Similarly the reference to blood (*sanguine*) in 788 foretokens the shedding of her blood in 832 (*sanguinulenta* 'bloody'), 839 (*sanguine*) and 841.

---

[41] For the extensive parallels see SCHENKL 404f., SOFER 10ff., MARCHESI 172ff., LEE 108, LE BONNIEC 1969 105ff. At 2.711ff. Ovid's lines on the portent of the snake, the oracle of Apollo and Brutus kissing the earth are very close to Livy 1.56. With regard to the actual rape itself cf. e.g. for 2.731 *quisque suam laudat* 'each man praises his own wife' Livy 1.57.6 *suam quisque laudare* 'each man praised his own wife'; for 2.734 (spoken by Collatinus) *non opus est verbis* 'there is no need for words' Livy 1.57.7 *Collatinus negat verbis opus esse* 'Collatinus said that there was no need for words'; for 2.787 *hostis ut hospes* 'an enemy like a guest' Livy 1.58.8 *hostis pro hospite* 'an enemy in the guise of a guest'.

[42] Contrast e.g. LEE and MARCHESI 172ff.

In some of those instances of foreshadowing there is an obvious irony, and that represents another important emotive element in *Fasti* 2.711ff. There is a basic grim irony in this story which Livy does not exploit but Ovid does; in fact the poet expands it by means of alterations and additions, with the result that his account has a nastier and darker tinge. Inherent in the tale is the irony of a contest over who has the best wife and Collatinus' suggestion of a quick trip back home to check leading to the rape and loss (via death) of Lucretia, but Ovid enhances the irony by making the contest specifically about the fidelity of the wives, by having it begun by Sextus of all people wondering if the wives are faithful and caring (2.727ff.), and by underscoring Collatinus' love for his wife (at 2.759f.). So too in Livy 1.57.10 it is briefly remarked that Lucretia's chastity actually engenders lust in Sextus, but Ovid takes this much further by dwelling on the fact that her purity arouses desire (2.765f.) and also by mentioning twice that her loving words about her husband incited Sextus to an adulterous attack too (2.765 and 773). Again, at Livy 1.58.2 when Sextus turns up at the unsuspecting Lucretia's home intending to rape her he is actually given a friendly reception by her, but Ovid underlines the irony at 2.787–90 by openly identifying him as an enemy at this point and commenting on her mistake. There are also many ironical touches which appear solely in Ovid. For example, in Lucretia's speech to her maids at 2.749 she says with her own lips *postmodo victa cades* 'you will be conquered and fall presently' (addressed in fact to the town of Ardea), and she must include Sextus among the better men kept away from their homes by the siege; at 750f. she complains of the men's absence at the war and wishes that they were coming back, when they have in fact returned and it would be much better for her if they stayed away; and at 751 she says that her husband is rash (in war) when he is much more rash in having brought Sextus with him. There is irony in the immediate sequel to that (2.759f.), when Collatinus, revealing his presence to his wife, tells her to lay aside her fear as he has come (in company with Sextus!), and she is delighted at seeing him. Finally, as he urges himself to go off and sexually assault Lucretia, at 2.781 Sextus says *exitus in dubio est* 'the outcome is uncertain' (not realizing that the eventual outcome for him will be exile and death), and after he has had sex with her he experiences a wholly inappropriate joy (as Ovid stresses at 2.811f.).

---

[43] For further foreshadowing here see p. 232.

Another major method of strongly affecting readers is change of emphasis. As a historian, Livy was very interested in the constitutional consequences of this event. He does cover the rape and suicide at length (1.57–8), but he devotes almost as much space to Brutus' reaction and the expulsion of the Tarquins (1.59–60). That aftermath is bulky and comes at the end, so that readers go away with it uppermost in their thoughts and the main thrust of Livy's account is political. Ovid, on the contrary, is much more interested in the personal and amatory side (the more emotive aspects).[44] Of 132 lines of verse

---

[44] Cf. LEE 107 and NEWLANDS 147. On Ovid's ending see further pp. 286f.

he assigns 116 to the rape and suicide but only 16 to the aftermath (of which a mere three and a half are concerned with the actual expulsion). Livy plays down the erotic element, being explicit only in connection with Sextus' feelings (1.57.10 *libido* 'desire', 1.58.2 *amore ardens* 'burning with passion', 1.58.3 *amorem* 'passion' and 1.58.5 *libido* 'lust'), leaving us to infer Collatinus' love for his wife (from the consolation for her at 1.58.9 and the grief over her death at 1.58.12 and 1.59.1), but making no clear implications of love on the part of Lucretia. The past master of erotic elegy has eros figure to a much greater extent, providing stronger motivation for Sextus and really bringing out the tragedy of what happened for the married couple. In Ovid love makes a brief appearance as early as 2.730 but first bulks large at 745–60 (quoted and translated on pp. 197f. below), where Lucretia spins among the maids and by her words and actions makes her devotion to her husband very plain, while his reaction and attitude at 759f. demonstrate a matching ardour. To that touching and natural affection is opposed Sextus' repulsive and immoral desire, emphatically concentrated and powerfully expressed at 761–6 and again at 769–79[45] (quoted and translated on p. 196 below), and then picked up yet again at 805 with *amans hostis* 'enemy lover' (an oxymoron accentuating his perversion of love). Then Ovid reverts to Collatinus' genuine and now (after the rape) tragic devotion at 817f., 821f., 829 and 835f., producing a second contrast to make Sextus' lust seem even more despicable. Also noteworthy is the new emphasis which Ovid gives to one particular episode in the story—the visit to check up on the wives. It is much more prominent in the *Fasti*, enlivened by means of direct speech and sentimental incident, and extended to form the longest individual segment in Ovid's version (it occupies lines 736–768, a quarter of the whole poetic narrative, whereas it is one of the shorter sections in Livy). Ovid is here lingering on something that is both moving and appalling, bringing to our attention the anxious Lucretia missing Collatinus so much and the loving reunion between husband and wife, giving us a brief glimpse of their bliss together (for the last time) and then freezing the fatal moments when Sextus becomes enamoured of his victim.

---

[45] Two bald references to Sextus being aroused by Lucretia's *forma* 'beauty' and being *amore ardens* ('burning with passion') occur quite close together in Livy (1.57.11 and 1.58.2) but without any further expansion. Ovid may well be echoing them at the beginning and end of these two passages on Sextus' passion (with *forma* 'beauty' in 763 and *ardet et iniusti stimulis agitatus amoris* 'he burned and, driven by the goading of an unjust passion' in 779), putting in between a lengthy description of Sextus' lust to provide stronger motivation than Livy has, and pawkily signalling the omission of that in the historian by means of two framing Livian reminiscences.

Characterization is also relevant in this connection. Two minor characters are significantly redeployed by Ovid. Lucretia's husband and father do not reappear after her death as they do in Livy but are reserved for more emotional effect prior to the aftermath. Collatinus' expanded role during the visit back home to check on the wives has been remarked on above. He also figures later in the confession and suicide scene, where he is accompanied by Lucretia's father and the pair are employed by Ovid to tug at the reader's heartstrings more than they are by Livy and to increase (in the light of their deep love for the woman) the heinousness of Sextus' crime and the tragedy of Lucretia's death. So in 815 they receive epithets not present in the historian: the father is *grandaevum* 'aged' and the husband is *fido* 'faithful' (quite possibly a pointed reapplication of Livy's *fidelis*, which also means 'faithful', used of the companions of the father and husband at 1.58.5). So too in Ovid the father and husband are more sensitive and anxious when they first arrive (the flurry of questions in 817f., the repetition of the questioning and, together with attempts to console, tears and fear in 821f.) and are more devastated by her death in 835f. (where they fall on her body, groaning and heedless of propriety).

Of major characters Sextus is more conspicuous and more immoral in the *Fasti* passage, so that he should arouse even stronger feelings than he does in Livy. Sextus' general role is much the same in the poet as in the historian, and there are many individual details in common, but Ovid's prince is more lustful, callous and determined. In the *Fasti* he achieves textual prominence early on and is ultimately the one who sets the whole rape in train when he (outrageously) wonders about the fidelity of the Roman wives. Livy (at 1.57.10f.) simply informs us that as a result of the trip back to check up Sextus was seized with a wicked desire to rape Lucretia, urged on by her beauty and her chastity, and then returned to camp. At 2.761ff. Ovid describes the initial onset of lust at greater length and in more detail, using powerful language and listing (with repetition) attraction after attraction to denote a violent passion; then after the return to the camp Ovid unexpectedly and ominously reverts to Sextus' desire, again with strong diction and listing and (this time more obsessive) repetition, making his passion seem still more violent:

> interea iuvenis furiales regius ignes
> concipit, et caeco raptus amore furit.
> forma placet niveusque color flavique capilli
> quique aderat nulla factus ab arte decor:
> verba placent et vox et quod corrumpere non est; 765
> quoque minor spes est, hoc magis ille cupit.
> iam dederat cantus lucis praenuntius ales,
> cum referunt iuvenes in sua castra pedem.
> carpitur attonitos absentis imagine sensus
> ille; recordanti plura magisque placent. 770
> sic sedit, sic culta fuit, sic stamine nevit,
> iniectae collo sic iacuere comae,
> hos habuit voltus, haec illi verba fuerunt,
> hic color, haec facies, hic decor oris erat.
> ut solet a magno fluctus languescere flatu, 775
> sed tamen a vento, qui fuit, unda tumet,
> sic, quamvis aberat placitae praesentia formae,
> quem dederat praesens forma, manebat amor.
> ardet, et iniusti stimulis agitatus amoris
> comparat indigno vimque metumque toro. 780
>
> Meanwhile the young prince is inflamed with a frenzied fire and, seized by a blind passion, is in a frenzy. He is attracted by her beauty and snow-white complexion and blonde hair and by the artless charm that she possesses. He is attracted by her words and her voice and the fact that she cannot be seduced; the less hope he has, the more he desires. The bird that heralds the daylight had already crowed when the young men returned to camp. The image of the absent woman consumes/rends/attacks his thunderstruck senses; as he recollects, he finds more things about her more attractive. She sat like this, she was dressed like this, she spun the yarn like this, her hair lay over her neck like this. She had these expressions, these were her words, this was her complexion, these her features, this her charming face. Just as after a great gale the waves are accustomed to decrease, but the sea is nevertheless swollen by the wind that was, so the passion remained which her beauty had inspired by its presence, even though the beauty was absent that had attracted him when present. He burned and, driven by the goading of an unjust passion, plotted dreadful violence against a marriage which didn't deserve that.

Ovid then devotes even more lines to the prince with a new addition at 781–3, in which Sextus urges himself on, scandalously claiming divine support for the rape and passing it off as an act of daring, similar to the capture of Gabii (thereby making Lucretia into a thing, a sort of military objective). In Livy (1.58.1) Sextus returns to Lucretia a few days later at an undetermined time of day, but in Ovid (2.785f.)

he is so resolved and so aroused that he goes back to her on the very next day, as the sun is preparing to hide its face (at sunset, and also so as not to witness the coming horror). The main outline of the rape is the same in both authors, but (unlike Livy) Ovid at this point addresses his Lucretia as *nupta pudica* 'chaste wife' in 794 (to stress the prince's crime), and at 797–804 (quoted and translated on p. 199 below) brings out at length her terror and aporia (to underscore Sextus' cruelty), and at 811f. depicts himself as so enraged that he apostrophizes and remonstrates with the rapist (thereby encouraging a similar reaction in his readers).[46]

The other protagonist, Lucretia, is fleshed out more as a person by Ovid and becomes in his hands more gentle and tender, and a figure of greater pathos,[47] in place of the austere (old Roman) matron of Livy. Ovid develops her from the start rather than just at the end (as Livy does),[48] making her come alive much more (physically and mentally) and bringing out her beauty much more, to make us feel sympathy for her during the rape and horror at the violation and ultimate destruction of such loveliness.

At Livy 1.57.9 during the surprise visit Lucretia is discovered spinning late at night among her maids and gives a gracious welcome to her husband and the other men with him. At 2.741ff. Ovid makes some substantial changes:

> inde cito passu petitur Lucretia, cuius
>   ante torum calathi lanaque mollis erat.
> lumen ad exiguum famulae data pensa trahebant;
>   inter quas tenui sic ait illa sono:
> 'mittenda est domino (nunc, nunc properate, puellae) 745
>   quamprimum nostra facta lacerna manu.

---

[46] For more on Ovid's characterization of Sextus see pp. 163ff.

[47] FOX 212ff. is surely misguided in his claim that it is not in the least shocking that Sextus rapes Lucretia in Ovid and that the sense of outrage is undermined because the rape is framed in terms that recall elegiac erotic poetry, so that Lucretia is an enticing elegiac woman. I fail to see how terms recalling erotic elegy would lessen outrage at a brutal rape which leads to suicide; Fox proffers only a few examples of such terms; and these supposedly elegiac touches are not particularly elegiac anyway (e.g. in literature and in life many females apart from mistresses in elegy did spinning among their servants and shed tears and felt fear at the thought of their man at war, while modesty, outside of *Amores* 2.4.11f. (incorrectly cited as 2.14.11–12), does not become the focus of desire very often in elegy). See further pp. 168f.

[48] The point was made by HEINZE 345.

> quid tamen auditis (nam plura audire potestis)?
> quantum de bello dicitur esse super?
> postmodo victa cades: melioribus, Ardea, restas,
> improba, quae nostros cogis abesse viros.
> sint tantum reduces. sed enim temerarius ille
> est meus, et stricto qualibet ense ruit.
> mens abit et morior, quotiens pugnantis imago
> me subit, et gelidum pectora frigus habet.'
> desinit in lacrimas inceptaque fila remisit,
> in gremio voltum deposuitque suum.
> hoc ipsum decuit: lacrimae decuere pudicam,
> et facies animo dignaque parque fuit.
> 'pone metum, veni' coniunx ait; illa revixit,
> deque viri collo dulce pependit onus.

> From there they quickly headed for Lucretia, at whose bedside were baskets and soft wool. By a dim light the servant girls were spinning the quotas of yarn assigned to them. In their midst she said in a faint voice: 'We must send to the master as soon as possible (hurry up, girls, right now!) a cloak made by our hands. But what do you hear (for you are in a position to hear more)? How much longer do they say the war will last? You will be conquered and fall presently: Ardea, you are resisting your betters, it is wicked of you to force our men to be absent. If only they were coming back! But in fact that man of mine is reckless and rushes anywhere with his sword drawn. I lose my mind and die whenever the image of him fighting presents itself to me, and an icy chill possesses my breast.' She stopped in tears, dropped the yarn that she had started on and lowered her gaze to her lap. This in itself was charming, and the chaste woman's tears were charming; her face suited and matched her character. 'Lay aside your fear, I have come,' said her husband; she revived and hung on her man's neck, a sweet burden.

Lucretia is there dutiful and chaste, as she is in Livy, but Ovid adds to that the depiction of her as a loving wife[49] (which makes the rape still more appalling) by specifying that she is spinning a cloak for Collatinus, by giving her a speech (made in a soft voice) that is filled with devotion and concern for him, by having her burst into tears and by making her respond to the sudden revelation of her husband's arrival in such an affectionate and girlish way despite the presence of onlookers. In addition, disturbingly in the midst of all that there is a reference to her beauty (757f.). As we have seen, in contrast to Livy, Ovid in the following lines goes on to give a quite detailed description of various aspects of that beauty, so that (as well as conveying Sextus' passion) he gives us a clearer idea of Lucretia's physical appearance.

---

[49] So HEINZE 344.

The rape scenes are in the main very similar in both the historian and the poet, but the latter depicts a more vulnerable Lucretia, bringing out her fear and helplessness more. He also inserts a simile which as well as catching her trembling, weakness and position under Sextus also intimates imminent pain and death; and he makes us privy to her thoughts (so that we can empathize and become more involved with her). At 2.797ff., after Sextus mounts the bed, sword in hand, and announces who he is:

> illa nihil, neque enim vocem viresque loquendi
> aut aliquid toto pectore mentis habet;
> sed tremit, ut quondam stabulis deprensa relictis
> parva sub infesto cum iacet agna lupo. 800
> quid faciat? pugnet? vincetur femina pugnans.
> clamet? at in dextra, qui vetet, ensis erat.
> effugiat? positis urgentur pectora palmis,
> tum primum externa pectora tacta manu.

> She [says] nothing; for she doesn't have a voice or the power of speech or a single thought in her whole heart. But she trembles, as a small lamb does sometimes when it has left the fold and been pounced on and lies beneath a vicious wolf. What should she do? Fight? A woman who fights will be defeated. Should she shout out? But there was a sword in his right hand to prevent that. Should she run away? His palms were on her breasts, pressing them, breasts touched then by another man's hand for the first time.

After the attack in Livy (1.58.5f., 7) Lucretia is *maesta* 'sad' and weeps, but in Ovid she is sadder: her tears are mentioned twice (in immediately successive lines, for emphasis) and are likened to a constantly flowing stream (820f.), while she is compared (at 814, reinforced by 818) to a bereaved mother about to go to the pyre of her son, which suggests a supremely sad woman at a supremely sad moment, as well as hinting at the loss of her virginity and honour and her approaching death.[50] Next Livy's Lucretia, when asked by her husband if all is well, launches into quite a long and rhetorical[51] speech in which she is explicit about the rape and demands vengeance; and when people try to console her, she asks for revenge again, refuses to set a bad example by living on and kills herself, collapsing on to the wound

---

[50] Cf. LEE 116 on these hints.

[51] See LEE 116.

(1.58.7ff.). The Lucretia at *Fasti* 2.823ff. is gentler and is pathetically crushed: she speaks only at the fourth attempt, amid blushes and (more) tears, cannot bring herself to tell the whole story of the rape and does not demand to be avenged; and when she kills herself, it is at her father's feet that she collapses (and she makes sure even then that her body is decently covered). That is the final mention of Lucretia the living person (as opposed to her corpse) in Livy, but Ovid brings her back into prominence at 2.845f., where at the very point of death she moves her dull eyes and her head slightly to signify approval of the vow of vengeance just made (spontaneously) by Brutus.

For a nuanced appreciation of the Ovidian account another substantial difference from Livy needs to be appended here, and that is tonal complexity. Whereas his predecessor is typically and totally serious, Ovid cannot resist being flippant even in connection with someone like Lucretia, and adroitly, while outdoing Livy in pathos, he works in a little humour too, mainly at the beginning and end, to avoid an excessively jarring effect. The tale of the fall of Gabii is used as an introduction to the rape, and there is a playful touch in the enigma over the relevance of those lines (and of 2.711ff. on the snake) to the Regifugium, the topic announced at 2.685 (see pp. 229ff.). Ovid's conclusion also has a facetious aspect, in that he was supposed to be telling of the flight of the king but dismisses the actual flight itself in less than a single line (2.851). I suspect two other instances of wit lurking beneath the surface. At 1.56.8 Livy had mentioned Brutus' deliberate pretence of stupidity (*ex industria factus ad imitationem stultitiae*). At 2.717 Ovid imitates that by describing Brutus as *stulti sapiens imitator* ('a wise imitator of a fool') and at the same time improves on it (via alliteration, juxtaposition, paradox and epigrammatic concision), so that there could be an impertinent sting in the tail to Ovid's phrase (alluding to his relationship to his source). There may be another little barb at 2.825f. There, in connection with his much less vocal heroine, who can hardly bring herself to tell her husband and father what has happened, Ovid remarks: '*eloquar' inquit/ 'eloquar . . . dedecus ipsa meum*?' (= 'Am I to tell,' she said, 'Am I to tell of my own disgrace?'). In view of the sequence there of three verbs of speaking on the run (talk, talk, talk) and the fact that *eloquor* was used of eloquent and ornate speech[52] it may well be that Ovid is subtly twitting the historian for making his Lucretia at this stage come out with such a long and rhetorical speech.

---

[52] *TLL* V,2.420.56ff.

Tullia

At 1.46ff. Livy recounts the end of the reign of Servius Tullius. His own daughter, Tullia, was involved in his downfall. She was the wife of Tarquinius Superbus. Originally she had been married to Superbus' brother and he had been married to her sister, but she tired of the brother's lack of ambition and took up with the bolder Superbus. At Tullia's instigation the spouses were murdered and then (after marrying Tullia) Superbus deposed king Servius and had him killed. Subsequently, while in her carriage, Tullia came across the corpse and ordered the reluctant driver to ride over it. She then proceeded on her way home, with herself and the carriage spattered with her father's blood. Ovid renarrates that tale[53] at 6.587ff., as an explanation of the origin of a covered statue in the temple of Fortuna:

> Tullia coniugio, sceleris mercede, peracto
>   his solita est dictis exstimulare virum:
> 'quid iuvat esse pares, te nostrae caede sororis
>   meque tui fratris, si pia vita placet? 590
> vivere debuerant et vir meus et tua coniunx,
>   si nullum ausuri maius eramus opus.
> et caput et regnum facio dotale parentis.
>   si vir es, i, dictas exige dotis opes.
> regia res scelus est: socero cape regna necato, 595
>   et nostras patrio sanguine tingue manus.'
> talibus instinctus solio privatus in alto
>   sederat: attonitum volgus in arma ruit:
> hinc cruor et caedes, infirmaque vincitur aetas:
>   sceptra gener socero rapta Superbus habet. 600
> ipse sub Esquiliis, ubi erat sua regia, caesus
>   concidit in dura sanguinulentus humo.
> filia carpento, patrios initura penates,
>   ibat per medias alta feroxque vias.
> corpus ut aspexit, lacrimis auriga profusis 605
>   restitit; hunc tali corripit illa sono:
> 'vadis, an exspectas pretium pietatis amarum?
>   duc, inquam, invitas ipsa per ora rotas.'

---

[53] In addition to extensive echoing of the general course of events and individual actions and details in Livy, Ovid also picks up some of his language. For example, Tullia is *ferox* ('ferocious' etc.) at 6.604 (cf. Livy 1.46.6), and (*ex*)*stimulo* is employed of her incitement of Superbus at 6.588 and Livy 1.46.2; he is duly aroused (*instinctus*) by her at 6.597 (cf. Livy 1.47.7); the people are amazed (*attonitus*) at the usurpation in 6.598 and Livy 1.47.9; and the driver of Tullia's carriage (*carpentum*) halted (*restitit*) at the sight of the corpse in 6.603–6 and Livy 1.48.6f. See further SCHENKL 405f., SOFER 14ff. and MARCHESI 118f.

certa fides facti: dictus Sceleratus ab illa
  vicus, et aeterna res ea pressa nota. 610
post tamen hoc ausa est templum, monimenta parentis,
  tangere: mira quidem, sed tamen acta loquar.
signum erat in solio residens sub imagine Tulli;
  dicitur hoc oculis opposuisse manum,
et vox audita est 'voltus abscondite nostros, 615
  ne natae videant ora nefanda meae.'
veste data tegitur; vetat hanc Fortuna moveri,
  et sic e templo est ipsa locuta suo:
'ore revelato qua primum luce patebit
  Servius, haec positi prima pudoris erit.' 620

Tullia, after securing marriage as a reward for a crime, continually goaded her husband with words such as these: 'What's the use of being well-matched murderers (you of my sister, and I of my brother), if we are content with a life of devotion [to my father]? Both my husband and your wife should have lived on, if we weren't going to dare any greater exploit. I designate as my dowry both the life and the throne of my father. If you are a man, go and claim the rich dowry that I have stipulated. Crime is a kingly thing. Kill your father-in-law, seize the throne and stain our hands with the blood of my father. Roused by such remarks, he sits on the high throne, even though not king. The people are amazed and rush to arms. Bloodshed and slaughter ensue, and the weak old man is defeated. The son-in-law Superbus holds the sceptre he seized from his father-in-law. Servius himself was slaughtered at the foot of the Esquiline, where his palace was; covered in blood, he collapsed on the hard ground. Intending to enter her father's home, his daughter rode in a carriage through the middle of the streets, high/proud and ferocious/defiant/arrogant. The driver, when he saw the corpse, halted in floods of tears; she berated him in these words: 'Are you going on or waiting for a painful punishment for your devotion? Drive your unwilling wheels over his very face, I tell you.' There is definite proof of that act: the street was named Wicked after her, and the business is burdened with a permanent stigma. However, after this she dared to set foot in the temple [of Fortune], her father's building; what I will relate is certainly astounding but did happen. There was a statue in the likeness of [Servius] Tullius seated on a throne; this is said to have put its hand over its eyes, and a voice was heard [saying]: 'Cover my head, so that it cannot see my daughter's evil face.' It was concealed by a robe that was supplied; Fortuna herself forbade its removal and spoke these words from her temple: 'The day on which [the statue of] Servius is first exposed through the uncovering of his face will be the first day of the abandonment of shame/decency/modesty/chastity/shyness/self-respect.'

As one major change from Livy (and with yet another new device for renarration) Ovid puts a new focus on Tullia,[54] making her the protagonist in his account, the prime mover and the prime actor, and not allowing other characters much of a share of the limelight. In the historian Tullia does play an important part (instigating the murders and driving over the corpse), but Servius and especially Superbus also have significant roles in the narrative and are textually prominent. Servius, for example, in 1.46.1 secures the support of the people for his rule, to counteract Superbus' attempts at undermining him, and at 1.48.1–4 opposes Superbus' seizure of his throne, is thrown out of the senate house and is making his way home when he is assassinated. In Ovid his involvement is much reduced: after appearing briefly as a murder victim and a corpse, he only becomes conspicuous at 611ff. as a statue (when Tullia's dominance has been long established). As for Superbus, Livy begins with him ambitiously plotting against Servius and depicts him as an already hot-headed and restless youth who is goaded on further by Tullia, who admires him. He achieves particular prominence in the affair of the dethronement, soliciting support, slandering the king, seizing the throne, abusing Servius in a long speech, and when Servius turns up throwing him out and having him killed by his agents (perhaps at the suggestion of Tullia). And when Tullia appears and hails him as king, Superbus tells her to leave the scene of the disturbance. In the *Fasti* passage Superbus is more passive and figures a lot less. Ovid begins the story at a point that foregrounds Tullia, places her name at the very start of his account and makes her the subject and Superbus the object in the initial sentence. Immediately after that he highlights her further in the arresting and (for the *Fasti*) rather long speech at 589–96 (where she shows no womanly admiration for her husband). The dethronement and murder occupy 597–602, but Tullia's influence (as instigator: see 597) is present there too, and these events are handled in far fewer lines than they are in Livy (so that the focus does not shift from Tullia for too long). Superbus' actions are much curtailed there as well: the only deeds specifically attributed to him are sitting on the throne and seizing the sceptre. Tullia had dominated 587–96 and now comes to the fore again at 603–10 (so that she swamps her husband), and here it is noteworthy that she is the one who decides to drive in the carriage (she is not told to do this by Superbus). She is also the one who acts at 611f., where she has the audacity to enter the temple. There is a further reference to her at 616, and she still has an important function when Ovid gets down to the promised *aetion*.

---

[54] Noted briefly by HERBERT-BROWN 1994 150. Cf. also SHARROCK-MORALES 194f.

The poet also makes his Tullia a still darker character, and in his hands she becomes the real villain of the piece. She has the same failings that she has in Livy, but there are added elements which mean that she comes across as even worse in the *Fasti*. Initial impressions have an impact, and at 2.587f. the first glimpse that we are given of Tullia is different from that in Livy 1.46: in Ovid she is already a murderess, and she is dominating her husband (Tarquinius Superbus!). Her speech at 589ff. packs a stronger and more concentrated punch than the equivalent one in Livy 1.47.2–6. It is more shameless and cynical too, more open about killing and more bloodthirsty (see 596 in particular, and note that throughout the emphasis is on murder rather than usurpation as in the historian). Ovid's Tullia is also a better (more powerful) speaker (see pp. 216f.). The act of driving over Servius' corpse is attributed to hearsay (twice) at Livy 1.48.7, but the poet is quite definite that Tullia did actually do this (2.609f.). He also makes her seem harder and a more unnatural daughter, in contrast to the driver who weeps (in Ovid but not in Livy), and in view of her brutal threatening and commanding in 607f. (not found in Ovid's model), where she orders the man to drive over her father's face (in Livy the carriage just goes over the body). On top of that Ovid introduces the sacrilege at 611f., and the atrocity of that act is pointed up by *ausa* ('she dared'), *mira quidem* ('certainly astounding') and the outraged reaction of the statue.

Ovid begins at a different stage in the tale (after the death of the first spouses), as has been noted; but more importantly (and by way of a final novelty in his procedures of renarration) he concludes at a different point. In fact he affixes to the Livian account a brand new ending, one which presents the *aetion* promised earlier but also does much more than that. The climax of Livy's narrative comes when Tullia rides over the body and continues on home, with her carriage and herself spattered with her own father's blood. At first sight it seems that Ovid falls short of that when he omits all the sensational gore. But then, whereas the historian moves on to a sober overview of Servius' reign, Ovid adds an unexpected and unprecedented sequel (the sacrilegious visit to the temple), which suddenly turns things right around and actually undermines Livy's climax. The poet ends with a further crime and an even more sensational incident, one which moves the story up a notch, to the supernatural level, with two uncanny and miraculous touches in the reaction by Servius' statue and the speech by Fortuna. Her utterance, ominous in itself, is made still more unsettling by the obscurity (how and why is the statue connected with *pudor*, by whom will *pudor* be abandoned, and what exactly does *pudor* mean here anyway?).[55] That is a concrete divine intervention, which tops Livy's vague allusions (at 1.46.5 and 1.48.7) to divine forces perhaps at work in the background. The poet also goes one better than his source by adding a second *aetion* here (both had already explained the origin of the name of the *Sceleratus Vicus* 'Wicked Street'). In addition, there is no parallel for the incident at 611ff., so that probably it was an arresting rarity and *dicitur* 'is said' in 6.614 is an 'Alexandrian footnote' parading Ovid's recherché *doctrina* (scholarship).[56]

---

[55] FRAZER IV 299 accepts the theory that there is allusion here to the belief that this was a statue of Pudicitia, but even if this is correct, the whole business is still mysterious, especially since Ovid clearly designated this as an image of Servius at 6.571 and refers to it as such here.

[56] After offering two accounts of the statue's origins, at 6.585f. Ovid introduced this narrative as yet another explanation which he would expound at greater length while still reining in his horses. It is possible that the image of reining in alludes to his overall compression of Livy's version, and that the *spatio maiore* 'greater length' plays on the new incident at the end which forms a substantial addition and takes the story further on than in Livy.

CHAPTER SEVEN

APERTURE

The importance of aperture is, of course, perfectly self-evident and should be clear to the meanest of intelligences; and so, if you think that it just doesn't matter how a narrative starts, you should be thoroughly ashamed of yourself, and you should certainly not have the temerity to assign yourself a status even remotely approaching that of literary critic.

Openings are often significant, as I hope to demonstrate in this chapter.

Above are two possible ways of initiating discussion of aperture, and obviously the reader's response to that discussion will be coloured quite substantially by whichever of the two beginnings is employed. Obviously too the point in a story at which narration actually starts is important, and so, for example, different effects will be achieved by commencing an epic about Aeneas with the Trojans nearly making it to Latium but being swept away by a terrible storm or with them finally making it to Latium or with the fall of Troy or with the birth of Paris. Openings can also seize the attention (as above, I trust), establish intimacy, draw us into a tale, make things clear for us, or do the opposite of all that. In other words they can affect radically our perception and reception of the whole narrative. Hence the nervousness experienced by many writers over getting going (for the author's viewpoint compare OZ 1ff.; he mentions those who, like Camus' Grand in *The Plague*, write and rewrite the first sentence of a book a hundred times and never get beyond it).[1] Scholars' investigation of aperture has recently become more sophisticated, especially over the last decade,[2] and this chapter will apply their theories and techniques to provide the first detailed anaysis of the beginnings of the mythical and legendary narratives in the *Fasti*. It will be seen that above all there is a sharp and playful intelligence very much in control and manipulating readers variously in a series of highly functional openings that demonstrate flexibility, ingenuity, inventiveness and unpredictability.

---

[1] On the importance of aperture to ancient authors see CLAY 113f.

[2] *Yale Classical Studies* 29 (1992) is devoted to this topic. See also SAID, BONHEIM 91–117, NUTTALL, ENSIGN, SPINA and OZ. All these critics blithely ignore the fact that it can be difficult to decide how far a beginning extends and to establish a clear demarcation between the beginning and the main part of a story. My working definition of a start is an opening unit at the end of which a preliminary stage is finished (initial act/incident/speech/description) and the sense

Aperture Prior to the Narratives

Formal preamble before the narrative actually begins is a kind of opening. Here several different modes of commencement are in evidence and Ovid frequently appears as an intrusive narrator. Sometimes he introduces a narrative with a bald statement (generally involving aetiology) like 'here is the cause of X' or 'now I must tell of Y'.[3] Rather more elaborate and much more common is the ploy of setting up a puzzle (to intrigue us and make us read on to find out the answer) by means of a direct or indirect question, such as *sed cur praecipue fugiat velamina Faunus,/ traditur antiqui fabula plena ioci* 'but an old and very funny tale is handed down to explain why Faunus has a particular aversion to clothes' (2.303f.).[4] Common too are addresses to the reader (for intimacy) and the use of the preamble to facilitate (especially aetiological) ring structure.[5] Ovid also often ushers in stories by means of a request to a god for information (and the response by the god is the story)[6] or for inspiration (rapidly succeeded by the inspired tale).[7]

In the latter case he clearly has an eye to a device common in epic poetry—the solemn appeal to a Muse or Muses for inspiration duly followed by a divinely prompted narrative, normally at the start

---

is complete and there is a strong stop. In the vast majority of cases in the *Fasti* the extent of openings is quite clear; when in doubt over this, I have gone for the shorter unit, to avoid the danger of claiming too much in connection with aperture.

[3] See 1.391f., 2.539f., 685, 3.661f., 4.417, 807f., 5.494, 604, 6.585, and cf. also (variants on this) 6.319f. and 417f.

[4] See 1.257f., 362, 2.246, 303f., 381f., 583, 3.170, 259f., 543f., 675f., 4.193f., 221f., 247f., 877f., 5.1, 191, 445f., 6.103, 349f., 481f., 653f., 693f.

[5] For these addresses see 2.381f., 583, 3.459f., 851, 4.418, 878, 5.1, 6.104 and cf. also 2.425ff. For such ring structure see e.g. 1.391f. and 439f., 2.303f. and 357f., 2.381f. and 421f. Ovid is also fond of ring composition *within* the narratives (2.459f. and 471f., 3.11f. and 45ff., 3.795f. and 807f. etc.).

[6] 1.257f., 3.167ff., 4.193f., 221f., 247f., 5.7f., 191f., 635f., 697.

[7] 1.467f., 2.359, 3.261f., 4.808, 5.447f., 6.481ff.

of a work or book or at an important point in the poem.[8] Ovid shows that he is working within that tradition by following his predecessors with just such a formal application to a Muse, justification of his petitions, mention of the addressee's parentage, requests for the personal presence of the divinity, a plea to the god to remind or prompt (*mone*) him and so on.[9] But typically Ovid also shows his independence and provides intellectual entertainment by reacting against the conventions. His appeals do not appear at the start of the poem or of any book (in fact they are well into books) or at particularly important points either. He only asks a Muse for inspiration once, turning elsewhere to five different deities (Carmentis, Egeria, Quirinus, Mercury and Bacchus), unlike Apollonius Rhodius and Virgil who return to the Muses. It is also a new twist to petition divinities who actually figure themselves in the narratives (i.e. Carmentis and Quirinus) or are related to characters in them (as Egeria and Bacchus are), and in contrast to the truthful and impartial Muses those five other inspiring deities have personal agendas and are unreliable to a greater or lesser extent (see pp. 34ff.). It is also a frivolous and subversive touch to pack in appeal after appeal (six in the surviving six books), all quickly and conveniently granted, thereby undermining the credibility of the whole process.

Our tricky and unpredictable author also includes introductory material that does *not* prepare readers for what follows but is deliberately misleading and sets them up for a tease. So, for example, at 6.481f. he announces a narrative that will explain why Matuta excludes female slaves from her temple, but then fails to explain that (hence 6.551ff.), and at 1.362, when he asks (in the middle of a sober discussion of different forms of offerings to the gods) what oxen have done to deserve being sacrificed, he seems to be serious enough, and that impression is reinforced by the opening of his version of the story of Aristaeus at 363ff., but it eventually turns out that in fact Ovid is there indulging in flippant play with Virgil (on the Aristaeus passage and this whole topic see further pp. 227f.). Finally, as yet another way of startling, in 18 cases there is no preamble to prepare the way for an ensuing narrative. Sometimes a new story just continues straight on from a preceding story;[10] more often a tale commences that is somehow connected with something in the text (especially to explain the origin of a star or rite just mentioned) but with no warning or hint that any tale is about to commence.[11]

---

[8] See e.g. Hom. *Il.* 1.1ff., *Od.* 1.1ff., *Hom. Hymn* 4.1ff., Ap. Rhod. 3.1ff., 4.1ff., Virg. *Aen.* 1.8ff., 7.37ff., 9.525ff., Prop. 4.6.11f. and the parody at Hor. *S.* 1.5.51ff. Cf. also the appeal for inspiration prior to a catalogue, as at Hom. *Il.* 2. 484ff. For further discussion see NORDEN 208f. and AUSTIN 1970 31f. Cf. also p. 29.

[9] See 1.467, 2.359, 3.261f., 4.808, 5.447f. and cf. e.g. Hom. *Od.* 1.10, Ap. Rhod. 3.1ff., 4.2, Virg. *Aen.* 7.41.

Aperture in the Narratives Themselves: General Characteristics

Openings within the actual narratives are normally focused and relevant, playing an important role in connection with motivation and plot, to set in train the story. In these generally streamlined accounts they tend to be brisk and workmanlike, getting readers into the meat of the tale quickly or even from the very first line. The longer and more leisurely starts occur especially in passages which are themselves lengthy, and there is generally good reason for the prolongation (e.g. at 1.469ff. Carmentis is building herself up, and at 3.277ff. Egeria is dwelling on the goodness and achievements of her beloved Numa: cf. pp. 34f. and 39f.).

Often Ovid includes playful allusion to beginnings in his beginnings, and allusion to ends (sometimes both simultaneously).[12] Often too openings contain what turn out to be key words, details and motifs. This is true, for example, of 2.585f. (*Iuppiter, inmodico Iuturnae victus amore,/ multa tulit tanto non patienda deo* 'Jupiter, overcome by an inordinate passion for Juturna, endured much that so great a god should not have to bear'), prior to the story of how the frustrated Jupiter got the Nymphs to agree to block Juturna's escape from him, but Lara informed on him, and for this had her tongue ripped out and was taken to the Underworld by Mercury, who raped her on the way. The first couplet's passion figures not only in Jupiter's feelings for Juturna but also in Mercury's for Lara; lack of restraint (*immodico*

---

[10] 1.543ff., 2.711ff., 3.49ff., 6.131ff.

[11] At 2.82, 155, 195, 429, 459, 481, 3.461, 737, 853, 4.641, 5.115, 169, 381 and 6.737.

[12] For various kinds of beginnings (e.g. birth, origins, new status) see 1.469f., 2.430, 3.11f., 179, 277, 677 etc.; for ends (such as death, termination of a reign) see 1.363, 2.196, 361, 687f. etc.; for both together see 2.712 and 714, 4.198f., 4.641–8, 4.809 and 811, 6.485f. and 490.

'inordinate') is shown by Jupiter in his longing for Juturna, by Lara in her use of her tongue to inform on Jupiter's plan (2.607) and by Mercury in his rape of the maimed Lara; and the endurance of treatment that a divinity should not have to bear is apposite to Lara as well as to Jupiter. Sometimes the very first person or thing mentioned is subsequently seen to be especially significant.[13] So the initial line of Ovid's novel story of Faunus' frustrated attempt to rape Omphale is *forte comes dominae iuvenis Tirynthius ibat* 'by chance the Tirynthian youth was walking as a companion to his mistress' (2.305). It later transpires that the first person referred to in the Latin, the companion (Hercules), is actually the one who foils the rape, after being nearly raped himself by Faunus (who has mistaken him for Omphale, who was sleeping nearby); and so *comes* 'companion' aptly stresses the hero's role as an escort, as well as going with *iuvenis Tirynthius* 'Tirynthian youth' to protectively enfold *dominae* 'mistress' in the word order.[14]

But Ovid is a lot fonder of being more obvious than this, to give his readers direction. Again and again it is easy to guess that a person, thing, word or motif in an opening is important (so at 2.83 the second word is *mare* 'sea', and one presumes on the basis of 2.79–82 that this will be the anecdote of Arion being forced to leap into the sea and being saved by a creature of the sea). Frequently Ovid goes even further than that, making his narratives clear and easy to follow from early on by presenting the nub of the story or the story in a nutshell (to be subsequently expanded), by elucidating major themes or problems, and by exhibiting protagonists in a patently meaningful relationship (e.g. as opponents, often with a prize or source of contention specified).[15] For instance, 2.483ff. raise the apotheosis of Romulus (and the whole passage is, as expected, about that), while at 2.687ff. we are shown the adversaries (Tarquinius and Gabii), the stake (the city) and the entire tale in brief (the city was taken through trickery). At 1.543ff., as Hercules drives into Latium the cattle from Erythea, one suspects at once that this is likely to be a version of his combat with Cacus over them, and Ovid strengthens that (perfectly correct) suspicion by showing us at the outset the two contenders and highlighting the all-important animals (*boves* 'cattle' is second word in 543, is repeated in emphatic position at 546 and is reinforced by *tauros* 'bulls' in 548). His lines on the death of the Fabii commence at 2.195f. with *haec fuit illa dies in qua Veientibus armis/ ter centum Fabii ter cecidere duo* 'this was the day on which Veientine weapons killed three hundred and six Fabii'. There we find the essence of the narrative (the death of the Fabii) and meet the opposing forces, with the victorious Veientines aptly taking precedence over the Fabii by appearing first, but with the Roman heroes of the story being referred to at greater length and taking up a whole verse (and the focus stays on them for the next two couplets of the introduction, as it does for most of the rest of the account). At 3.461ff. Ovid deftly packs in the protagonists (Bacchus and Ariadne) and the source of friction between them (the eastern princess whom Bacchus finds attractive), the major theme of infidelity (highlighted by twofold allusion in *periuro* 'perjured' and *perfidus* 'faithless' in 461 and 464) and the whole tale in miniature (as with Theseus, Ariadne's grief is ultimately misplaced, since the unfaithfulness has its expedient side for her, in the honour of stellification).

---

[13] See GOLD for this technique in Horace.

[14] Cf. SCHILLING 1993 I 125 on the dual senses of *dominae*.

[15] Of course, openings can also be misleading (see above and below), to exploit expectations nurtured by this common helping of the reader, and Ovid sometimes holds back protagonists for build up (e.g. the rapists Mars and Dis at 3.11ff. and 4.419ff.).

In the vast majority of openings the first strong stop comes at the end of the first couplet (the elegiac unit). Variants on this norm stand out and are worthy of note. So the passage on Arion is introduced at 2.83 with a single (brisk) end-stopped line, which also gains liveliness from its double question and anaphora: *quod mare non novit, quae nescit Ariona tellus?* ('what sea does not know Arion, what land is ignorant of him?'). Ovid recounts the order to murder Romulus and Remus at 3.49ff. as follows: *hoc ubi cognovit contemptor Amulius aequi/ (nam raptas fratri victor habebat opes),/ amne iubet mergi geminos. scelus unda refugit*: ('When this was discovered by Amulius, the scorner of justice (for as victor over his brother he had seized and held his power), he ordered the twins to be drowned in the river. The water shrank from the crime'). There the unusual run-over after the first distich gives stress to the dramatic and grim *amne iubet mergi geminos* (and the brief *scelus unda refugit* with its striking personification also takes the attention). The longest initial sentence occurs at 3.545ff. in the passage on Anna's flight from Carthage and adventures in Italy:

arserat Aeneae Dido miserabilis igne, 545
  arserat exstructis in sua fata rogis,
compositusque cinis, tumulique in marmore carmen
  hoc breve, quod moriens ipsa reliquit, erat:
PRAEBVIT AENEAS ET CAVSAM MORTIS ET ENSEM:
  IPSA SVA DIDO CONCIDIT VSA MANV. 550

> Pitiable Dido had burned with the fire of love for Aeneas, she had burned on the pyre constructed for her death. Her ashes were gathered, and on the marble of her tomb was this short epitaph which she left herself as she was dying: AENEAS FURNISHED THE MOTIVE FOR DEATH AND THE SWORD: DIDO ACTUALLY FELL BY HER OWN HAND.

That sentence extends for a full three couplets and has a decided cumulative impact as Ovid packs much into it. Its length (suitable for the long narrative that follows) and the series of grave events that it recounts make for an epic feel on the surface, but from early on there is also much here that is mock-epic. The first line with its poignant juxtaposition of the two lovers and with the bulky *miserabilis* 'pitiable' seems solemn enough, but it is immediately deflated in the pentameter with the rather dark play on words in *arserat* 'had burned' (not to mention the jaunty placement of terms connected with fire at either end of 545 and 546), as Ovid cheekily condenses the first four books of the *Aeneid* into two (elegiac) lines. At 547ff. he goes beyond *Aeneid* 4 to material not found in the *Aeneid* (the funeral and epitaph) and plays with Virgil (549 looks to *Aeneid* 6.458, where Aeneas says to the dead Dido *funeris heu tibi causa fui?* 'ah, was I the cause of your death?'), aptly so for the ensuing narrative, which is a sequel to Anna's role in Virgil and makes numerous twists to the *Aeneid*.[16] In addition, the epitaph is exactly the same as that requested of Anna by Dido in *Heroides* 7.195f., so that Ovid is amusing himself by having Dido's request there come true here (and also subtly working allusion to the protagonist Anna into the preamble).

Normally Ovid begins at the beginning, i.e. at the most logical and obvious point in the action to start narrating, but for variety and interest sometimes his narratives commence at an unexpectedly early or late stage of the story.[17] So at 5.11ff. Polyhymnia in her derivation of *Maius* 'May' from Maiestas goes back even beyond the birth of Maiestas to the Creation, in an attempt to fill out and add dignity to her account (cf. pp. 46f.). Again at 5.605f. Ovid launches his *Fasti* version of the rape of Europa at an advanced juncture, with Jupiter already in the form of a bull and offering his back to the heroine (nothing at all on how he and she got to the scene of the abduction, on her playing or picking flowers, on him being attracted and changing his appearance etc.). Such a late start in this myth is enliveningly unusual,[18] and it puts the stress on a significant moment. It also contributes to the general concision of this passage, and by starting off with Jupiter as a bull (*taurus* is third word in the first line) it immediately ties this (very focused) account in with the constellation Taurus which it is intended to explain.

---

[16] See especially pp. 129ff.

[17] Early at 2.687ff., 3.11ff., 277ff., 5.11ff., 81ff.; late at 2.195ff., 459ff., 3.461ff., 5.605ff.

Four Main Types of Openings

BONHEIM (91ff.) posits four modes of aperture—comment (telling the reader what the story is about, its message etc.), description (setting the scene, introducing character(s), place, time), report (the narration of action) and speech.[19] These categories do cover major elements and are broadly useful, if not entirely comprehensive (e.g. they do not cover extended motivation or address to readers or characters in the story). Bonheim allows for mixed openings, and such combination of two or more of the four modes is frequent in the *Fasti* (occurring in 38 out of 58 narratives). The only types that appear unmixed are description (at 6.131ff. only) and report (in 19 examples). Overall, report is most common (figuring in 57 out of the 58 narratives), again showing the importance of action in these beginnings, while comment is least popular (at 2.248 and 3.738 only); there is some description in 27 cases and speech in 18 instances.

Report tends to make for lively commencement, especially if the action is significant or dramatic, and it can get things moving and draw readers into the story from early on, leading them to wonder what happens next and to read on. A variously effective example of report occurs at 6.485ff. (where Juno persecutes Ino for bringing up her own nephew Bacchus, driving Ino's husband mad and making him kill one of their children, while Ino nearly kills the other):

---

[18] Compare Horace *C.* 3. 27.25ff.

[19] Cf. RACE, who also breaks openings down into four types—narrative (narrating action), dramatic (presuming a situation in which the speaker of the poem finds himself), discursive (setting forth a proposition for which the poem argues) and hymnal (conventions of the rhapsodic or cultic hymn). RACE's categories are not as relevant to or helpful for aperture in the *Fasti*.

> arserat obsequio Semele Iovis: accipit Ino 485
> te, puer, et summa sedula nutrit ope.
> intumuit Iuno, raptum quod paelice natum
> educet: at sanguis ille sororis erat.
> hinc agitur furiis Athamas et imagine falsa,
> tuque cadis patria, parve Learche, manu; 490
> maesta Learcheas mater tumulaverat umbras
> et dederat miseris omnia iusta rogis.
> haec quoque, funestos ut erat laniata capillos,
> prosilit et cunis te, Melicerta, rapit.

> Jupiter's compliance had incinerated Semele; Ino received you, boy, and diligently reared you with the utmost care. Juno was enraged because Ino was bringing up the son that had been snatched away from a rival [Semele]; but he was her sister's flesh and blood. As a result Athamas was driven by madness and a delusive vision, and you fell by your father's hand, little Learchus. His grieving mother had entombed the ghost of Learchus and had paid all the offerings due to the sad pyre. After rending her hair in mourning, she too leapt up and snatched you from the cradle, Melicertes.

This is an arresting start, thanks to the flurry of action and the succession of short sense-units (from the brief and startlingly expressed *arserat . . . Iovis* down to 488). This is also a powerfully dark start, because the lines rapidly summarize a series of sombre deeds (reinforced by several emotive adjectives). The only act that is not dismal is that of Ino in 485f. (setting up a pointed contrast between nurturing heroine and destructive deity). But Ino there is menacingly encompassed by Juno and her influence, by the death of Semele (due to Juno's trick) and the raging goddess; and in 494 Ino too seizes one of her children with a view to killing it. There are grim patterns in the action as well—the death of Learchus in return for the nurturing of Bacchus, and the parallel attacks by the parents on the two children. These are just the first of many adventures for Ino, and one is invited to continue reading, especially to find out how exactly Melicertes fares.

Speech has immediacy and encourages eavesdropping. It is one way of highlighting characters and giving us our first impression of them, and it is often very revealing about them. It can easily get us involved with the speaker, arousing sympathy, hostility, amusement and so on. Speech can also catch a significant moment[20] and may play a substantial role in the plot. At 2.157ff. (prior to Callisto being raped by Jupiter, expelled by Diana and persecuted by Juno) there is an exchange between Callisto and Diana in which the former swears to remain a virgin and the latter says that if Callisto keeps her promise she will be the leading nymph in Diana's band. As well as introducing the important motif of virginity, speech there puts the focus on the protagonist and another major figure at the point when the nymph enunciates her fatal oath. It also ushers in the pathos, as it shows us Callisto's good intentions and the great honour and happiness that she lost. These are the first two of five functional short quotes in this passage,[21] and the vocal nymph of 157f. is reduced to a groaning bear incapable of speech in 186, while Diana's friendliness here contrasts with her subsequent dismissal of the pregnant Callisto at 173f.

Much longer is the speech assigned to Tullia, who married her husband (Tarquinius Superbus) after they had both murdered their former spouses (his brother and her sister) and then urged her husband to seize the throne from her own father (Servius Tullius); when he did that, she drove a coach over her dead father's face (her words, at 6.589ff., are quoted and translated on pp. 201f.). Tullia is the protagonist and the real villain of this lurid tale, and speech is used to reinforce her prominence at 587f. (where her name appears as first word and she is the subject of the sentence and in the ascendant over the male). She takes the attention because of the shocking nature of what she says, because her words play a crucial role (directly spurring her husband to act: see 597) and because such a long speech is unusual in the *Fasti* narratives (especially in an opening), as is such extensive development of character (via indirect characterization, whereby one extrapolates from her outburst). Her words make her really come alive, as a thoroughly evil person, revealing her as unnatural, shameless, cynical, ambitious, determined, self-centred, relentless, bloodthirsty, vigorous, dominant and so on. She is also clearly a clever woman who has lavished much care on this immoral exhortation, and she is a chillingly elegant and powerful speaker (e.g. emphatic placement and repetition of many words, vehement alliteration in 594f., the epigrammatic *regia res scelus est* 'crime is a kingly thing' in 595, and the considered climax at 594ff., where she urges her own father's death a full three times and becomes progressively more blunt). All of this gets the story off with real force.

---

[20] As at 2.157ff., 307f., 481ff. and 4.255ff.

[21] Speech figures later at 167, 173f. and 180.

Description often provides useful background and makes for clarity.[22] When developed and concentrated it holds back the action, dwelling and focusing on someone or something which the reader presumes is significant (and thereby frequently heightening anticipation), and it can also build mood and atmosphere, and increase the impact of what follows (e.g. as calm before the storm).

Description can take the form of direct characterization, and there is a noteworthy example of that at 6.131ff. (of the screech-owls that Cranae eventually manages to ward off), which makes for an arresting start.[23] Description of setting can be similarly effective. So at 4.641ff. there is a gloomy opening with a full eight lines on setting that are pervaded by death, all of which also enhances the impact of the happy ending at 671f. More elaborately, a quiet menace shot through with irony is built up with the lovely setting for the rape of Proserpine at 4.419ff.:

> terra tribus scopulis vastum procurrit in aequor
>   Trinacris, a positu nomen adepta loci, 420
> grata domus Cereri: multas ea possidet urbes,
>   in quibus est culto fertilis Henna solo.
> frigida caelestum matres Arethusa vocarat:
>   venerat ad sacras et dea flava dapes.
> filia, consuetis ut erat comitata puellis, 425
>   errabat nudo per sua prata pede.
> valle sub umbrosa locus est aspergine multa
>   uvidus ex alto desilientis aquae.
> tot fuerant illic, quot habet natura, colores,
>   pictaque dissimili flore nitebat humus. 430
> quam simul aspexit, 'comites, accedite' dixit
>   'et mecum plenos flore referte sinus.'
> praeda puellares animos prolectat inanis,
>   et non sentitur sedulitate labor.
> haec implet lento calathos e vimine nexos, 435
>   haec gremium, laxos degravat illa sinus;

---

[22] On description and its relationship to action see Hamon in TODOROV 147ff., and BAL 129ff.

[23] See pp. 4f.

> illa legit calthas, huic sunt violaria curae,
> illa papavereas subsecat ungue comas;
> has, hyacinthe, tenes; illas, amarante, moraris;
> pars thyma, pars rhoean et meliloton amat; 440
> plurima lecta rosa est, sunt et sine nomine flores:
> ipsa crocos tenues liliaque alba legit.
> carpendi studio paulatim longius itur,
> et dominam casu nulla secuta comes.

> The Trinacrian land [Sicily] juts out into the vast sea with its three rocky corners. It acquired its name from its shape and is a favourite home of Ceres. It contains/she occupies many cities, among them fertile Henna with its well-ploughed soil. Cool Arethusa had given an invitation to the mothers of the gods, and the blonde goddess [Ceres] had come to the sacred banquet. Her daughter, with her usual girlish companions, was roaming barefoot through her meadows. Down in a shady valley there is a spot that is wet with the abundant spray from a high waterfall. All the hues that nature possesses were there, and the earth was tinted brilliantly by different flowers. As soon as she caught sight of it, she said: 'Come here, my friends. Let's all go home wth laps full of flowers.' Their girlish minds found this petty prey tempting, and they were too absorbed to notice how much work they were putting in. One fills baskets woven out of pliant wicker, one loads down her lap, another the loose folds of her dress. One gathers marigolds, another is taken with beds of violets, a third nips off the heads of poppies with her nails. These are detained by you, hyacinth; those linger over you, amaranth; some love thyme, some love corn-poppies and melilot. Many, many roses are gathered, and nameless flowers as well; Proserpine herself gathers delicate saffron and white lilies. In her enthusiasm for picking, bit by bit she goes quite far away, and it so happens that none of her companions follow their mistress.

All the details there appeal to various senses and enable us to form quite a clear and distinct picture. The place is a *locus amoenus* (beauty spot) suitable for the lovely Proserpine but also treacherously unthreatening.[24] It plays a definite role in the story, as its flowers distract her companions and induce Persephone to isolate herself. The peaceful scene of the flower-picking and the leisurely pace due to so much description means that there is a build up to Dis' appearance at 445f. and the sudden and speedy action there as he abducts Persephone really stands out by way of contrast.[25]

---

[24] For rapes in such a location see further PARRY.

[25] All of this also applies to the description of the setting for the rape of Rhea Silvia at 3.11ff.

An increasing concentration is evident in the course of this opening. There is a zoom-in to the place of the abduction, from the whole island of Sicily and the sea around it (419f.), to Henna (422), to the plural meadows (426) and then to the singular valley (427) and its well watered spot with all the flowers. The description at 427ff. becomes more precise and detailed, making for a sharp focus there (while the surrounds are in soft focus), and the chiaroscuro in the bright flowers within the shady valley also directs attention to this particular location. There is also a narrowing to Persephone on her own at 442ff., and her isolation there is stressed by the contrast with the host of companions and flowers at 435ff. In the centrepiece the flowers have associations (so apt for Persephone) of beauty, delicacy, brightness, fragrance and also of vulnerability and transience, and the picking of them ironically foreshadows the abduction of Persephone (see p. 79) and her rape (as rape often followed on from such a pastime).[26]

Colouring

A standard technique is the use of aperture to influence the reader's attitude and colour his/her reactions. Ovid often indicates to us at the outset that his story is worth reading (intimating that it is interesting, amusing etc. and concerns important persons and events) and brings out clearly for us its emotional impact (pathos, horror and so on) to prepare us for what follows. His openings frequently encourage in the reader a particular interpretation of people's motivation, actions and roles (whether in the initial lines themselves or in subsequent ones). Ovid is particularly fond of manipulating us by building sympathy or antipathy towards characters, so that we get involved with them, want to see them succeed or lose and are really affected by their fortunes and the tale's happy or unhappy ending.

Negative colouring is adequately represented by Tullia and the screech-owls (mentioned in the previous section on pp. 216f.), where the openings make it clear that these are horrific tales with well defined villains, and we are thereby led to feel relief at the eventual banishment of the awful birds and pity for the dreadful Tullia's victim

---

[26] Cf. e.g. HOPKINSON 205.

(her own father). On the positive side, 2.83ff. bring out the marvellous nature of the anecdote and present us with an obvious hero (Arion), to make us critical of the ship's crew who rob him and force him to jump overboard, and pleased when the dolphin finally rescues him:

> quod mare non novit, quae nescit Ariona tellus?
>   carmine currentes ille tenebat aquas.
> saepe sequens agnam lupus est a voce retentus,
>   saepe avidum fugiens restitit agna lupum;
> saepe canes leporesque umbra iacuere sub una,
>   et stetit in saxo proxima cerva leae,
> et sine lite loquax cum Palladis alite cornix
>   sedit, et accipitri iuncta columba fuit.
> Cynthia saepe tuis fertur, vocalis Arion,
>   tamquam fraternis obstipuisse modis.

> What sea does not know Arion, what land is ignorant of him? He used to check rushing water with his song. Often the wolf pursuing a lamb was stopped by his voice, often the lamb running away from a ravening wolf was halted. Often hounds and hares lay down in the same patch of shade and a deer stood next to a lioness on a rock, and the chattering crow sat at peace with Pallas' bird [the owl], and the dove joined the hawk. Melodious Arion, Diana (they say) was often entranced by your music as if by her brother's.

Ovid emphasizes here that his narrative is about a major poet (not just some nonentity about whom we couldn't care less), in fact a much greater poet than Arion had hitherto been.[27] We are induced to admire Arion because of his great renown and especially because of his wondrous skill. Ovid gives him mythical and quasi-divine status, putting him on a par with Orpheus[28] and Apollo himself. With a series of examples extending over several lines (and with juxtaposition of natural enemies in 85–8 and insistent anaphora) Ovid brings out Arion's amazing power over various creatures (of land and air) and even over water, and his ability to entrance an actual goddess (and the sister of the god of song at that). We should also respect Arion for being a force for harmony and peace there. All of that is conducive to outrage at the sailors' treatment of such a person. In particular, in the light of his almost divine standing in 91f.,[29] their behaviour seems sacrilegious; it also contrasts pointedly with Arion's non-violent influence, and makes them seem even worse than brute nature in their relationship to the poet. Admiration for Arion also fosters delight at the happy ending (a miracle justified by and prefigured in the opening).

---

[27] Compare Herodotus 1.23f. and see NEWLANDS 180ff.

[28] On the magic powers of Orpheus' song see e.g. Simonides 567 PMG, Apollod. *Bibl.* 1.3.2 (and Frazer's note in the Loeb edition), Ovid *Met.* 10.86ff.

[29] On top of the fact that poets were supposed to be sacrosanct (e.g. Ovid *Am.* 3.9.17f.).

2.195ff. show that Ovid is about to launch into a dramatic and sad tale, about some brave Romans (the Fabii clan, who were wiped out in an ambush during the war against Veii in 477 BC):

haec fuit illa dies in qua Veientibus armis 195
  ter centum Fabii ter cecidere duo.
una domus vires et onus susceperat urbis:
  sumunt gentiles arma professa manus.
egreditur castris miles generosus ab isdem,
  e quis dux fieri quilibet aptus erat. 200
Carmentis portae dextro est via proxima iano:
  ire per hanc noli, quisquis es; omen habet.
illa fama refert Fabios exisse trecentos:
  porta vacat culpa, sed tamen omen habet.

> This was the day on which Veientine weapons killed three hundred and six Fabii. A single family had undertaken the burden of defending the city, and that clan took up arms, as promised. From the same camp out marched the noble soldiers, any one of whom was fit to be their leader. The nearest route was through the right-hand arch of Carmentis' gate; don't pass through that, whoever you are: it is ill-omened. They say that the three hundred Fabii went that way; the gate is blameless, but still it is ill-omened.

There Ovid establishes early on the narrative's tragic tone with the bleak picture of mass death in 196. The following two couplets encourage an attitude of approval and esteem towards the Fabii, conjuring up in 197f. their patriotism, bravery and determination (note the placement of *una domus* 'a single family' and *urbis* 'the city' at either end of 197), and in 199f. their nobility of birth and spirit,[30] their martial prowess and their powers of leadership too. But after all those positive points, ill omen dominates 201–4 (with *omen habet* 'it is ill-omened' given emphasis by position and repetition), so that in 195f. and 201ff. there is a sombre frame and doom enfolds the heroic Fabii. As a result there is a marked poignancy and sense of inevitability in the lines that follow, and one may well respect even more their dash and courage there (while despising the cowardly enemy).

---

[30] For these two senses of *generosus* (199) see *OLD* s.v. 1 and 2, *TLL* VI,1. 1799.44ff., 1800.70ff.

A bit more complex are cases where Ovid tries to arouse simultaneously both sympathy and antipathy (with the two reinforcing each other). So at 3.853ff. we are incited to hate Ino, who is even prepared to bring about a famine and be guilty of impiety to get at her stepchildren: she causes the crops to fail, sends a messenger to Delphi to get an oracle about the problem, bribes the messenger to say that the deaths of her stepchildren were demanded by the oracle and joins the citizens in forcing her husband (the king) to kill his own children. At the same time one is meant to feel sorry for the reluctant (859) father under so much pressure and especially for the innocent youngsters, about to die together and groaning over their shared fate (861f.). Also a bit more complex are cases where not Ovid himself but gods within the poem who narrate or inspire stories go in for such colouring. In these cases the colouring may still have an effect, but the alert reader will see through it and be amused, touched etc. (as when, out of many examples that could be cited, the goddess Egeria builds up her husband Numa at 3.277ff.: see pp. 39ff.). A still more complex instance occurs at 6.485ff., where Bacchus inspires an account which is simultaneously favourable to his aunt Ino and hostile to her persecutor Juno, and which also contradicts completely Ovid's own unsympathetic attitude to Ino at 3.853ff. (see pp. 57ff. and 151).

The Narrative Hook

Arousing partiality and hostility in connection with characters in the stories is also a kind of narrative 'hook' (i.e. a means of hooking or engaging the reader's interest early on). Ovid employs several other forms of narrative hook as well (sometimes two or more of them simultaneously). For one thing, he likes to open with startling and dramatic material. Some examples of this have already been touched on (Arion's musical skills at 2.84ff., Ino's crimes at 3.853ff. and the horrific attributes of the screech-owls at 6.131ff.). Other instances include two fish supporting gods on their backs at 2.459f., Ariadne's tolerant attitude to Theseus' treachery at 3.463f. and the bloody ghost of Remus speaking at 5.457ff. At other points there is a brooding, ominous start to take our attention, as with the exchange between Callisto and Diana at 2.157ff., the lines on the Fabii (2.195ff.) and Tullia's exhortation at 6.587ff. (which is startling too; compare also the prodigy of the snake at 2.711f. and the conversation between

Cybele and Attis at 4.225ff.). Sex always sells, and there is often an erotic element in these openings, where love and sex may actually figure in the lines themselves or anticipation of them may be carefully fostered (most notably in connection with Bacchus' festival at 1.393ff.: see pp. 226f.).[31]

Violence also has a natural appeal, and so Ovid frequently begins with violent action or conflict or creates expectation of them.[32] In particular we find a combination of sex and violence (and humour) at 2.305ff., where Faunus spots Omphale in company with Hercules:

> forte comes dominae iuvenis Tirynthius ibat: 305
> vidit ab excelso Faunus utrumque iugo;
> vidit et incaluit, 'montana'que 'numina', dixit
> 'nil mihi vobiscum est: hic meus ardor erit.'
> ibat odoratis umeros perfusa capillis
> Maeonis, aurato conspicienda sinu: 310
> aurea pellebant tepidos umbracula soles,
> quae tamen Herculeae sustinuere manus.

> By chance the Tirynthian youth was walking as a companion to his mistress; Faunus saw them both from a high ridge. He saw, grew hot with passion and said: 'Mountain goddesses, you are nothing to me: this one will be my flame.' The Maeonian woman was walking along with her perfumed hair streaming over her shoulders, eye-catching in a golden dress; a golden parasol warded off the sun's warmth, but it was held up by Hercules' hands.

The amatory component is obvious. On the humorous side, we can appreciate at once the amusingly passionate Faunus instantaneously enamoured, sweepingly dismissive of all the nymphs and rather imprudently setting himself up as a rival to Hercules; and in retrospect, after Faunus mistakenly tries to rape Hercules in the dark, one can see a possible prefiguring pun in *hic meus ardor erit* 'this one [literally "here"] will be my flame' as *hic* could also mean 'this man'. Ovid also tries to engage by building up substantial anticipation of conflict. He first (in 305) presents Hercules linked with his mistress, and to designate him he uses *iuvenis* 'youth' (with its connotations of vigour and heroic and soldierly qualities)[33] and *Tirynthius* 'Tirynthian' (with its reminder of the great Labours performed for the king of Tiryns), combining the two to form a periphrasis with an epic ring[34] and thereby depicting Hercules as a formidable opponent. Next we see Faunus immediately in love (with *incaluit* 'grew hot with passion' reinforced by *ardor* 'flame'), and that is followed at once by a description of the gorgeous Omphale, providing strong motivation for his desire. But then in 312 Hercules recurs, with a reiteration of his link to Omphale, and with *manus* (his powerful hands)[35] emphasized by position. In the word order Hercules (in 305 and 312) suggestively encompasses Faunus (in 306–8) and is closely bound up with Omphale (juxtaposed in 305, and in 312 immediately succeeding her appearance in 309–11). One envisions quite a struggle between a god and this superhero over a woman to whom they are both so attached.

---

[31] For the erotic hook see also 2.305ff., 585ff., 3.11ff., 468, 677ff., 4.223ff., 419ff., 5.81ff., 199f., 605ff., 6.108ff., 323ff. and 393ff.

[32] See 1.543ff., 2.305ff., 3.467f., 796ff., 858ff., 4.197ff., 809ff., 879ff., 5.699ff., 6.131ff., 485ff., 587ff. and 737ff.

[33] See *OLD* s.v. 1b, *TLL* VII,2. 734.33ff., 736.1ff.

There are several other instances of the humorous hook,[36] amongst which the most notable is 3.677ff., where Mars approaches the goddess Anna Perenna and asks her to help him with his love for Minerva:

> nuper erat dea facta: venit Gradivus ad Annam,
>   et cum seducta talia verba facit:
> 'mense meo coleris, iunxi mea tempora tecum;
>   pendet ab officio spes mihi magna tuo. 680
> armifer armiferae correptus amore Minervae
>   uror, et hoc longo tempore volnus alo.
> effice, di studio similes coeamus in unum:
>   conveniunt partes hae tibi, comis anus.'

> She had recently become a goddess. Gradivus came to Anna, took her aside and said: 'You are worshipped in my month, I share my time with you; a great hope of mine depends on a favour from you. A warrior myself, I have been seized with love for the warrior Minerva; I'm inflamed, and I have been nursing this wound for a long time. See to it that we two divinities with similar interests get together: such a role suits you, kind old lady.'

It is diverting to see Mars reduced to begging an ex-human (especially the humble little old lady of 3.663ff.) and being so obsequious in 679f., with the urgent tricolon crescendo, the vigorous alliteration and the emphatic placement of *tecum* 'with you' and *tuo* 'to you' (which quite possibly plays on the Du-Stil in prayers to gods). Especially in view of the intimate tête-à-tête in 678, there is also a misleading suggestion in the fawning and vehemence and stress on closeness in 679f. that Mars has fallen in love with Anna and is propositioning her there (easy enough to accept after Numicius' passion for her at 3.647f.). But then it turns out in 681 that of all people it is actually Minerva to whom he is attracted (the name is kept back to the end for maximum impact and wittily juxtaposed with *amore* 'love'), the professional virgin who famously opposed Mars and helped Diomedes against him in the *Iliad*.[37] So this is also a startling hook (and an erotic one). There is a droll touch too in Mars rather desperately repeating the (hardly pertinent) warrior connection in 681 and 683 in a futile attempt to justify his mad idea. There is play on words as well, with *correptus* 'seized' of Mars in 681 (the verb is often applied to the seizing of weapons),[38] the *volnus* 'wound' of 682 (Mars himself is wounded, and in love rather than combat) and *coeamus* 'get together' in 683 (the term is also used of soldiers rallying or joining battle, and of sexual intercourse).[39] To add to the entertainment, in 681f. there is reminiscence of Virgil *Aeneid* 4.1f. (of the tragic Dido, just before she speaks to her sister Anna of her love for the hero Aeneas and implicitly appeals for assistance) *at regina gravi iamdudum saucia cura/ volnus alit venis et caeco carpitur igni* 'but the queen, long since injured by an agonizing passion, nurses the wound with her lifeblood and is wasted by an unseen fire'. Thus Ovid, in an anything but tragic context, actually likens Mars to Dido, in fact has the god represent himself as Dido, and do so in a speech to Anna Perenna (identified with Dido's sister Anna at 3.545ff.) begging for help in connection with his own doomed (but comically doomed) love for a (female) warrior.[40]

---

[34] Cf. Virg. *Aen.* 7.661f. *victor/ . . . Tirynthius* 'Tirynthian victor' and also 8.228.

[35] See e.g. Virg. *Aen.* 8.259ff.

[36] There is actual or prospective humour at 2.585ff., 3.11, 545ff., 677ff., 738 and 4.419ff.

Mood

Another standard procedure is the establishment of a distinct mood in the introductory lines. There is a range of moods, and they are usually suitable for what follows and helpfully prepare the way for it.

---

[37] 5.846ff. The alliteration of a in 681 may be meant to seem stumbling or breathless. There may also be flippant play on the derivation of *Gradivus* from *gradior* 'go, step' (e.g. Varro *L.L.* 5.85) in *venit Gradivus* 'Gradivus came' (677).

[38] *TLL* IV.1040.54ff.

[39] *OLD* s.v. 1b, 1c, 2, *TLL* III.1417.63ff., 1418.7ff.

[40] See further pp. 111f.

An aptly light tone is often created via humour (examples of this have just been seen). At the opposite end of the scale, sometimes there is a suitably gloomy atmosphere.[41] So at 5.451ff. (explaining the origin of the name Lemuria for a festival of the dead) Ovid indulges in his favourite technique of accumulating significant words, details and motifs,[42] here in four couplets densely packed with material on Remus' death and ghost (blood-stained and feebly murmuring), his funeral and the mourning (with his foster-parents returning as darkness falls to a hard bed).[43]

One always has to be on one's toes with Ovid, and so occasionally the mood created at first is misleadingly inappropriate to a greater or lesser extent. At 6.105f. (on Cranae) there is a deceptively sober and solemn start to what is in fact a light-hearted tale (see p. 74) thanks to the reference to the ancient grove of mysterious Helernus[44] and the sacrifices brought there by priests.[45] Two cases are more tricky and complex. Firstly, at 2.585ff. (the Juturna/Lara rape narrative, on which see pp. 76ff.) Ovid's dexterity ultimately increases the pathos. The humorous beginning (about Jupiter's futile pursuit of Juturna) is apt for the rest of the flippant lines on Juturna in that passage, but is completely inapt for the grim verses on Lara that immediately follow on and so heightens their tragic impact. Secondly, at 1.393ff. (about Priapus' foiled attempt to rape Lotis) the overall effect is frivolous. There Ovid commences by building up a markedly playful and erotic atmosphere: the very first word is *festa* 'festival', and it is a festival of Bacchus at that, while the participants are notoriously wanton and sportive—the gods who wait on Bacchus and who like *ioci* 'fun' (which covers both jests and love),[46] Pans, Satyrs (described specifically as being keen on sex), nymphs of the mountains and lonely countryside (who might well want some company), Silenus on an ass whose back comically sags under his weight, and Priapus, who scares birds with his huge phallus. The eroticism there (expanded at 405ff.) does fit with Priapus' upcoming attraction to Lotis but is finally a tease, encouraging us to expect that sex will figure in the story, only for there to be no group sex and for the rape attempt to fail, so that there is no copulation after all. The initial light-heartedness is doubly appropriate—to the general tone of the narrative, and to Ovid's sport with the reader's expectations.[47]

---

[41] See 2.195ff., 3.853ff., 5.451ff., 6.131ff. and 485ff.

[42] Cf. e.g. 1.393ff., 2.195ff., 3.11ff., 853ff., 6.485ff.

[43] Note also the solemn expression *tumulo . . . condidit umbras* 'entombed the ghost' in 451, redolent of Ennius and Virgil (see BÖMER II 319).

[44] On whom see FRAZER II 301 and BÖMER II 86.

[45] Compare also the tranquil mood at 3.11ff., although one knows all along that this is just the calm before the storm.

[46] For the latter see *TLL* VII,2. 289. 37ff.

Having Fun with the Reader

Ovid clearly enjoyed having fun with his readers, and one of the main ways in which he did this was by giving them a misleading impression at the outset of a narrative. The previous section contained three instances of that (1.393ff. on Priapus and Lotis, 2.585ff. on Juturna and Lara, and 6.105ff. on Cranae), and the section before that touched on another one (Mars seemingly propositioning Anna Perenna at 3.677ff.). So too after the various derivations of the name Quirinus offered at 2.475–80, the *nam* 'for' in 481 naturally seems to usher in a story that will support one of them (the last one in particular), but what we actually get is simply Romulus' apotheosis. Similarly at 5.639ff. Tiber at first appears to be a venerable and reliable narrator with a perfectly good memory, until the sudden deflation at 646 (for further discussion of this particular ploy see pp. 55f.).

A more elaborate example of such reader deception occurs at 1.363ff.:

> flebat Aristaeus, quod apes cum stirpe necatas
> viderat inceptos destituisse favos;
> caerula quem genetrix aegre solata dolentem 365
> addidit haec dictis ultima verba suis:
> 'siste, puer, lacrimas: Proteus tua damna levabit
> quoque modo repares quae periere dabit.
> decipiat ne te versis tamen ille figuris,
> impediant geminas vincula firma manus.' 370

> Aristaeus wept because he saw that his bees had died (progeny and all) and had abandoned the honeycombs which they had begun. His azure mother soothed his grief with difficulty and concluded with these final words: 'Stop crying, my boy. Proteus will remedy your losses and tell you how to recover what has perished. But, so that he cannot elude you by changing his shape, bind both his hands with stout chains.'

---

[47] See p. 12. Ovid plays a similar trick at 6.321ff. (Priapus' attempt on Vesta), but the mood is not as developed there.

Ovid here tries to fool us into believing that his account is going to be rather sad and in the manner of Virgil *Georgics* 4.317ff. In the serious context of a discussion about different forms of offerings, Ovid's first word is *flebat* 'wept', and that is soon reinforced by *aegre solata dolentem* 'soothed his grief with difficulty' and *siste . . . lacrimas* 'stop crying'. It even seems at first that Ovid's account will be sadder than Virgil's in view of the above and the fact that Ovid spends a line and a half over the death of the bees (in contrast to Virgil's single line at *G.* 4.318); with *puer* 'boy' in 376 Ovid makes Aristaeus seem more vulnerable than he does in Virgil (where he is always designated as a *iuvenis* 'young man'); and Ovid drops the various lighter touches found in Virgil (such as Clymene's song about the loves of the gods at *G.* 4.345ff.). But at the same time Ovid in general follows closely the action and order of events in Virgil: as at *Georgics* 4.317ff., Aristaeus is here upset over the death of his bees and has an interview with his mother in which she improves his morale, tells him to turn to Proteus, who will make things turn out all right, and advises him to use chains to catch the god and not be tricked by his transformations (and in the lines that follow, again as in Virgil, Aristaeus does go to Proteus and shackles him while the god is asleep, and Proteus duly changes his shape, but cannot escape, and so returns to his own original form and speaks). The surprise comes at 376ff., where entertainingly Proteus does not (as in Virgil) launch into a long, tragic story of Eurydice's death (while being pursued by Aristaeus) and Orpheus' foiled attempt to recover her from the Underworld (so that Ovid drops completely the most memorable and poignant part of Virgil's version), and Proteus does not (as in Virgil) speak in a rage and leap into the sea without giving Aristaeus the specific advice that he needs on how to make good his losses (but instead he calmly, clearly and briskly tells him how to renew his bees).[48]

The mystification of readers is another noteworthy ploy. At 1.469ff. Carmentis herself is supposed to inspire lines to explain the origins and nature of her festival, the Carmentalia. The first narrative prompted by her at 469–542 does not offer any such explanation, and the reader is even more puzzled at 543ff., when under her influence Ovid starts another narrative (about Hercules' combat with Cacus) which seems to be getting even further off the point. And in fact it is right off the point, because Carmentis is so carried away with imposing herself (cf. pp. 34ff.) that she never does address the issue. Something similar happens at 6.697ff., where Minerva does not get to the subject either and one is at the start (as at the end) bewildered about the relevance of her response to Ovid's question about why the Quinquatrus is so called (cf. the discussion on pp. 61f.). At 3.737ff. Ovid seems to be relating the invention of honey by Bacchus (cf. 736), and his account appears to be complete at 744, when honey is duly discovered. This too leaves us wondering: at 738 Ovid promised an amusing story, but lines 737–44 hardly amount to much of a story and are not at all amusing. But then at 745ff. we realize that there was false closure at 744, when we get the rest of the tale and the humour.[49]

---

[48] Some scholars (e.g. BÖMER II 45, LE BONNIEC 1965, 72f.) have remarked on a few of the Virgilian echoes and differences, but apparently without seeing the point of them. See further pp. 109f. and 134f.

In book two there is an extended and complicated instance of such mystification which also involves multiple openings. At 2.685ff. Ovid announces that he will tell of a festival called the Regifugium (= Flight of the King) and apparently connects it, as others did, with the flight into exile of the last Roman king, Tarquinius Superbus:

> nunc mihi dicenda est regis fuga. traxit ab illa 685
>   sextus ab extremo nomina mense dies.
> ultima Tarquinius Romanae gentis habebat
>   regna, vir iniustus, fortis ad arma tamen.
> ceperat hic alias, alias everterat urbes,
>   et Gabios turpi fecerat arte suos. 690
> namque trium minimus, proles manifesta Superbi,
>   in medios hostes nocte silente venit.
> nudarant gladios: 'occidite' dixit 'inermem:
>   hoc cupiant fratres Tarquiniusque pater,
> qui mea crudeli laceravit verbere terga' 695
>   (dicere ut hoc posset, verbera passus erat).
> luna fuit: spectant iuvenem, gladiosque recondunt,
>   tergaque, deducta veste, notata vident:
> flent quoque, et ut secum tueatur bella precantur.
>   callidus ignaris adnuit ille viris. 700
> iamque potens misso genitorem appellat amico,
>   perdendi Gabios quod sibi monstret iter.

---

[49] See further pp. 283f.

hortus odoratis suberat cultissimus herbis,
sectus humum rivo lene sonantis aquae:
illic Tarquinius mandata latentia nati 705
accipit, et virga lilia summa metit.
nuntius ut rediit decussaque lilia dixit,
filius 'agnosco iussa parentis' ait.
nec mora, principibus caesis ex urbe Gabina,
traduntur ducibus moenia nuda suis. 710

> Now I must tell of the flight of the king. The sixth day before the end of the month derived its name from that. The last king of the Roman race was Tarquinius, a man who was unjust but brave in battle. He had captured some cities and sacked others, and he had made Gabii his by means of a disgraceful trick. For the youngest of Superbus' three sons, who clearly took after his father, went right among the enemy one silent night. They bared their swords; he said: 'Kill an unarmed man: that's what my brothers would want, and so would my father Tarquinius, who cut my back to ribbons with a savage flogging' (to be in a position to say this, he had endured a flogging). There was a moon: they scrutinized the young man and sheathed their swords, and when he pulled down his clothing they saw the marks on his back. They even wept and begged him to help them with the running of the war, in their ignorance. He craftily agreed. Now in a position of power, he sent a friend to ask his father to show him the way to destroy Gabii. At the foot [of the palace] there was a very trim garden with fragrant plants; a stream of purling water cut though its soil. Tarquinius received his son's secret message there, and mowed down the tallest lilies with his staff. When the messenger returned and told of the lilies he'd knocked down, the [king's] son said: 'I understand my father's orders.' Immediately those in charge of Gabii were killed, and the city, stripped of its leaders, was surrendered.

The flight of Tarquinius was traditionally due to the rape of Lucretia by his son Sextus, so the reader is perplexed and intrigued here. Lines 687f. seem focused on the Regifugium, but 689f. seem to wander a bit, and then 691ff. appear to go off at a complete tangent with the account of the capture of Gabii. As that account goes on and on, the more one reads the more one is drawn in, trying to discern the relevance. In fact, as different readers will work out at different points, there is a (distant) flashback here (note the pluperfects in 689f.) and this is all preamble to the assault on Lucretia. This is an extraordinary but also a clever point at which to commence and it makes for a tantalizing but also a functional opening to the rape narrative. Several effective techniques of aperture are in evidence here. This is an aptly dramatic and chilling start, and it establishes an aptly solemn and dark mood. It also introduces several pertinent themes (the evil nature of the Tarquin dynasty, treachery, abuse of hospitality and death), and it colours our reactions to Sextus (who is depicted here as a devious and brutal villain). Although not logically connected with the rape, the Gabii story is an analogy (almost a microcosm) and foreshadows it (in the case of Lucretia too the insidious Sextus will make a night approach, be welcomed, win a shameful victory thanks to a cunning speech and be responsible for death). But at the same time there are contrasts which increase the force of the tale of Lucretia. Events at Gabii were bad, but things become even worse in connection with Lucretia. There was at least some bravery on Sextus' part when he went up to the armed townsmen, but he subsequently makes a cowardly attack on a lone, defenceless woman. So too the passage on Gabii is short and concerns nameless, faceless men, whereas the actual rape is recounted at much greater length and is much more tragic, especially because the character of Lucretia is developed extensively, so that she really comes alive as a person and affects us.

Alert readers anticipating the rape will have discerned the introductory function of 2.687ff., when suddenly another puzzle appears at 2.711ff.:

> ecce, nefas visu, mediis altaribus anguis
> exit et exstinctis ignibus exta rapit.
> consulitur Phoebus. sors est ita reddita: 'matri
> qui dederit princeps oscula, victor erit.'
> oscula quisque suae matri properata tulerunt, 715
> non intellecto credula turba deo.
> Brutus erat stulti sapiens imitator, ut esset
> tutus ab insidiis, dire Superbe, tuis.
> ille iacens pronus matri dedit oscula Terrae,
> creditus offenso procubuisse pede. 720

> Lo and behold (a horrible sight) a snake emerged from the midst of the altar/altars and snatched the [sacrificial] innards from the dead fire. Phoebus was consulted. The following oracle was given in response: 'The first man to kiss his mother will be the victor'. The group readily believed the god but didn't understand him, and each of them quickly kissed his mother. Brutus sensibly pretended to be a fool, to escape a treacherous attack by you, dreadful Superbus. Lying on his face, he kissed Mother Earth; the others believed that he had tripped and fallen flat.

With the arresting *ecce* ('lo and behold') there is a disorienting lurch to the snake of 711. One is left wondering if this is still part of the Gabii narrative, how many altars there are[50] and where their/its location is, which oracle of Phoebus is being consulted and by whom, and what all this has to do with Sextus' attack on Lucretia.[51] In fact Ovid has abruptly moved on to a quite different story, one about the consultation of the oracle of Apollo at Delphi (as a result of a prodigy) by Brutus and two sons of Tarquinius Superbus and the reponse that the first one to kiss his mother would be master of Rome. But it seems likely that even readers familar with this tale could not feel confident that it was the one being told here until line 714, since in other surviving versions the oracle is consulted because of an epidemic or a snake that slid out from a crack in the pillar of the king's palace.[52] Those who do realize that this is the story being recounted are still challenged to work out the relevance to the rape of Lucretia and the Regifugium. Sooner or later they should perceive that what we have here is a bold and unexpected touch—yet another tangential opening, and once more one that is functional. So there are various links between the two beginnings, often making for effective reinforcement. At 711ff. the serious and sombre mood is continued, and there is more colouring (this time prejudicing us against Tarquinius and in favour of Brutus, an eventually important figure who receives brief prominence at 717–20). Again germane themes are raised (horror, death, rapacity and the menace of the Tarquins), and again there is foreshadowing (the sinister, repulsive and predatory snake looks forward to the rapist Sextus; the credulity and human blindness in 716 and 720 anticipate 788–90, where Lucretia trustingly welcomes Sextus into her home as a guest; and 719 prefigures Brutus' final victory, when he manages to drive out the Tarquins and becomes one of Rome's first two consuls). Taken together, 687ff. and 711ff. constitute a double opening as part of a long and structurally complex introduction to the long and structurally complex account of the actual rape itself (which finally commences at 721ff.).

On top of that with typical cheek and intricacy Ovid employs the very next two narratives (also concerned with a rape) for similarly involved mystification, to catch readers out with the same kind of trick almost immediately (for fuller discussion of this particular ruse see the remarks on pp. 278ff. below). There 3.11–48 do constitute a discrete tale but also ultimately act as elaborate preamble for 3.49–78. As such an opening, 3.11ff. tease by misleading and have other humorous aspects too (like demoting the rape of Rhea Silvia to mere prologue, and having an introductory narrative that is longer than the narrative which it introduces).

---

[50] *Altaria* can denote one or more altars: see *TLL* I 1725.18ff.

[51] Scholars have noted some of these puzzles: see HEINZE 343, LE BONNIEC 1969 106 and especially FOX 210f.

[52] See Dio. Hal. 4.69, Livy 1.56.

CHAPTER EIGHT

OVID AND OVID

In these narratives Ovid is conducting a dialogue not only with Virgil, Livy and other predecessors but also with himself, and self-imitation[1] is yet another part of the intertextual richness and complexity. Here too Ovid has fun and tests and parades his ingenuity, but this time in connection with his own writings, as he plays on associations of his own earlier poetry and redeploys, modifies, contradicts and tops himself. Improving on Ovid must represent a really major challenge, especially for Ovid himself. It also shows that, engagingly, the poet did not take himself too seriously and did not regard his own work as sacrosanct. Scholarly attention so far has focused mainly on those stories which are told in both the *Fasti* and the *Metamorphoses*.[2] This chapter will take a fresh look at them, and then will move on to other areas of self-reference in the *Fasti* (most of them largely or totally neglected).

Doublets in the Fasti *and* Metamorphoses

There are eight such doublets—the tales of Lotis, Hippolytus, Europa, Ino, Romulus' deification, Marsyas, Callisto and Persephone.[3] Obviously such extensive doubling is not accidental, and where he produced versions of a myth in both the *Fasti* and *Metamorphoses* Ovid will have intended us to read one account with an eye to the other.[4] When we realize that the poet is returning to an anecdote, we are drawn in, to see what alterations we can detect, to savour the subtlety, cleverness etc. Such pairs also add to the lively variety in the *Fasti* and *Metamorphoses* as a change from the norm of tales told only once by Ovid, and as such a vitalizing device they are widely separated across the two works, so as not to overdo things.[5] They represent an entertaining twist to the Ovidian rewriting of others' narratives, as here he rewrites his own (not yet 'published') narratives and uses himself as a quarry (for variation, inversion, capping etc.). The fact that Ovid is not just modifying someone else's tale but telling one differently from the way in which he himself had already told it really highlights the protean nature of myth, the infinite flexibility of narrative and the fact that there is no definitive version, no single way to open, close etc. Above all Ovid was a raconteur at the height of his powers, revelling in the story-telling process and his own feats of narrative gymnastics, delighting in his virtuosity and inventiveness, as he presented a different version of the same myth again and again (on a full eight occasions), employing a wide variety of techniques to ensure the differences. He is like the obviously admired Ulysses of *Ars Amatoria* 2.128 who was asked repeatedly about the fate of Troy by Calypso: *ille referre aliter saepe solebat idem* 'he was often accustomed to tell the identical tale in a dissimilar way'.[6] It is this sustained and dazzling exercise in renarration by Ovid that the rest of

---

[1] On Classical self-imitation in general see CAIRNS 18, MURGATROYD 1979 160, 279f., 1994a 70, 238f., WEST-WOODMAN 143ff. and PUCCI.

[2] See the works cited below. On Ovidian self-imitation apart from these stories see e.g. WEST-WOODMAN 121ff., GINSBERG 9ff., MILLER 1993, WOYTEK and Watson in BOYD 2002 147.

[3] HEINZE's untenable theory that Ovid used two distinct narrative techniques (one elegiac and one epic) in the *Fasti* and *Metamorphoses* has bedevilled criticism of these doublets for far too long, and it is now time to move on to a broader analysis and more fruitful aspects. BERNBECK (especially 127ff.) and Little (in ZINN 64ff.) have undermined most of Heinze's claims; note also that asymmetrical stress on parts of the story (said to be an elegiac characteristic) is found in the narratives on Europa and Ino at *Met.* 2.836ff. and 4.416ff., and lengthy speech (supposedly an epic feature) occurs in the lines on Ariadne in the *Fasti* (3.471ff.), not the *Metamorphoses* (8.172ff.). In fact what Ovid is trying to do in these doublets (and in the other narratives in the two poems) is to be surprising and unpredictable rather

---

than conform to a set technique for each work. At the same time as part of the 'crossing of genres' these links between the two poems actually pull together again and again the *Fasti* (with its loftier elegy, on which see e.g. Harrison in HARDIE 2002 85f.) and the *Metamorphoses* (epic with an elegiac flavour). See further Keith in BOYD 2002 245ff. (for elements of elegy in the *Metamorphoses*), and HINDS 1987b 115ff., MERLI 2000 37ff. and Miller in BOYD 2002 181f. (for epic material in the *Fasti*).

[4] So, in addition to following the same general story line, he often includes verbal and thematic links (see, for instance, p. 237 below). We cannot be sure that the version in the *Fasti* was written before the one in the *Metamorphoses* or vice versa, as Ovid seems to have worked on the two poems at the same time (cf. e.g. FANTHAM 1998 2f.).

[5] Only the last two doublets in the *Fasti* occur in immediately succeeding narratives (Marsyas at 6.697–708 and Hippolytus at 6.737ff.). So too there is diversity within the pairs themselves (with regard to length, tone, subject matter, characters etc.).

[6] Cf. Tarrant in HARDIE 2002 20f. and 27ff.

this section will explore, examining passages from the *Fasti* and also passages from the *Metamorphoses* for their bearing on the *Fasti*. Such comparison usefully throws into sharp focus significant features of the narratives in the *Fasti*.

One way in which Ovid differentiated accounts was to include an alternative major detail. At *F.* 1.393ff. he describes how Priapus tried to rape the nymph Lotis after she had fallen asleep at a festival but she was awakened by a braying ass and escaped (for text and translation see pp. 81ff.). A different version of her escape occurs at *Met.* 9.342ff., where Iole explains how her sister Dryope came with her baby son to a pool where there was a water-lotus:

> carpserat hinc Dryope, quos oblectamina nato
> porrigeret, flores, et idem factura videbar
> (namque aderam): vidi guttas e flore cruentas
> decidere et tremulo ramos horrore moveri. 345
> scilicet, ut referunt tardi nunc denique agrestes,
> Lotis in hanc nymphe fugiens obscena Priapi
> contulerat versos, servato nomine, vultus.

> Dryope had plucked some blossoms from this to offer her son, to please him, and I thought that I would do the same (for I was there): I saw drops of blood fall from the blossoms and the branches move with a shivering shudder. Of course, as the country people now at long last relate, the nymph Lotis, fleeing Priapus' lust, had altered her appearance, turning it into this but keeping her name.

There are verbal and thematic links between the epic and elegiac passages—*Lotis in* at the start of hexameters, *fugio* of Lotis, allusion to Lotis' *vultus*, and *obscenus* used in connection with Priapus,[7] as well as apparent cross-references to water and trees.[8] These ensure that as we read one passage we are reminded of the other, which means that the alternative detail stands out starkly. There are reinforcing differences too (in context, length, tone etc.) to subtly heighten its impact. Ovid thus startles and intrigues his readers, teasing them over the 'correct' version of the story (as he leaves the discrepancy unresolved), and also making a serious point about the unreliability of the tradition and of narrators and poets (including himself).[9]

---

[7] See *F.* 1.423, 436, 420, 437 and *Met.* 9.347f.

[8] At *F.* 1.404, 423, 436 and *Met.* 9.334ff.

[9] Cf. *Am.* 3.12. Another spin to the Lotis rape occurs at *F.* 6.321ff. (see pp. 85ff.). Alternative details also occur at *F.* 1.259ff. and *Met.* 14.775ff. (where the citadel is saved either by Janus or by Venus and the nymphs), *F.* 4.507ff. and *Met.* 5.448ff.

Sometimes we find major details present in one doublet but absent from the other, as with the Hippolytus narratives at *F.* 6.737ff. and *Met.* 15.497ff. In the former Ovid is explaining the origin of the constellation called the Snake-Holder (= Asclepius, who was killed in punishment for raising Hippolytus from the dead but was then turned into a star and a god by Jupiter), while in the latter Hippolytus (in his new incarnation as the minor god Virbius) is attempting to console Egeria for the death of her husband Numa by pointing out that others (such as himself) had endured equal and even worse losses and had gone on to better things from them. The *Fasti* passage has details not found in the *Met.* which are connected with its own interests—rather obviously the stellification of Asclepius; and less obviously the revival of Hippolytus by means of herbs which a snake had used to bring another snake back to life (a neat tie-in with the Snake-Holder).[10]

There is also a different focus and stress as a result of the difference in the narrators and their purposes. The *Fasti* concentrates on Asclepius and the process by which he became a constellation, whereas the *Metamorphoses* is interested in Hippolytus and in his suffering and overcoming of it. So the *Fasti* at 6.746ff. plays up Asclepius' role in the restoration of Hippolytus (unlike *Met.* 15.531ff.), and at 757ff. presents the aetiological conclusion of Asclepius' punishment and deification (absent from *Met.* 15). So too *Met.* 15.500–529 are devoted to the end of Hippolytus (30 lines, as opposed to the 9 at *F.* 6.737–45), and they bring out much more Phaedra's wickedness and the horror of his actual death, to make the ordeal which he experienced and put up with seem even worse than Egeria's. And, in contrast to the single, rather perfunctory couplet at *F.* 6.755f., Hippolytus makes his metamorphosis into Virbius occupy 11 climactic lines in the *Met.* (15.536–46), dwelling on the way in which he triumphed over adversity and even came out of it better off (as a minor deity), and highlighting the way in which this was brought about thanks to Diana (also

---

(where Ceres visits either Celeus or an old woman) and *F.* 6.497ff. and *Met.* 4.525ff. (in the latter, in contrast to the former, Ino and her son are deified as soon as they leap into the sea).

[10] For further (minor) differences see SALZMAN 322. This is a common technique of variation: e.g. Callisto's oath to preserve her virginity figures in *F.* 2.155ff., but not in *Met.* 2.401ff.; in the Ino narratives Juno goes down to the Underworld and Tisiphone maddens Ino and her husband at *Met.* 4.416ff., but not at *F.* 6.485ff.; and tears are shed for Marsyas and become a river at *Met.* 6.382ff., but not at *F.* 6.697ff.

to encourage Egeria, who should similarly rise above her loss and might even receive some help herself from a more powerful divinity).[11]

There is some combination or separation of stories here as well (depending on which was written first) and a reversal of order as another means of variegation. What is a single narrative at *F.* 6.737ff. appears as two separate narratives in the *Metamorphoses* (2.642ff. prophesy the murder and deification of Asclepius; and 15.497ff. recount the killing of Hippolytus and his restoration as Virbius). And, whereas in the epic poem the death of Asclepius is mentioned first and then is followed by the description of the end of Hippolytus, in the elegiac work Hippolytus' demise precedes that of Asclepius. In the *Fasti* the interweaving of those two tales facilitates all sorts of intricate links. For example, both young men are killed by their divine grandfather; just as Diana is indignant over the death of Hippolytus (6.745), so Apollo is indignant over the death of Asclepius (6.761); both the patient and the doctor are restored in a new form and with a new name and location; and (cf. 6.762) Jupiter revives the dead Asclepius whom he had himself killed for reviving the dead. In the *Metamorphoses* even though the tale of Asclepius' death and apotheosis stands on its own at 2.642ff., it is there combined with a prophecy of the end of Chiron;[12] and when the prophet says to the baby Asclepius at 2.648 *bis tua fata novabis* ('you will twice renew your fate'), the primary reference is to him being reborn as a god, but Ovid may well (in retrospect or prospect) have an eye to the two narratives of his deification in *Met.* 2 and *F.* 6.

Ovid's lines on the rape of Europa at *F.* 5.605ff. and *Met.* 2.836ff. illustrate several more techniques employed for telling the same tale differently. In the epic an enamoured Jupiter asks Mercury to move a herd of cattle to the shore where Europa is playing with her friends, turns himself into a handsome and unthreatening bull, joins the herd, slowly entices her on to his back, then carries her out to sea and, when he reaches Crete, abandons his bovine disguise; meanwhile Europa's father sends his son Cadmus to look for her, threatening him with banishment if he fails; Cadmus wanders far and wide but cannot find her and becomes an exile, subsequently founding Thebes. The account in the *Fasti* (explaining the origin of the constellation called Taurus or the Bull) differs significantly:

---

[11] In the same way *F.* 5.605ff. accentuates the abduction of Europa, while *Met.* 2.836ff. has its main stress on events prior to that; and in connection with Ino *Met.* 4.416ff. develops Juno's rage and the maddening of Athamas and Ino much more than *F.* 6.485ff. does and has more metamorphosis.

[12] The latter forms a separate narrative in the *Fasti* (5.381ff.).

> praebuit ut taurus Tyriae sua terga puellae 605
> Iuppiter et falsa cornua fronte tulit,
> illa iubam dextra, laeva retinebat amictus,
> et timor ipse novi causa decoris erat;
> aura sinus implet, flavos movet aura capillos:
> Sidoni, sic fueras aspicienda Iovi. 610
> saepe puellares subduxit ab aequore plantas,
> et metuit tactus adsilientis aquae;
> saepe deus prudens tergum demisit in undas,
> haereat ut collo fortius illa suo.
> litoribus tactis stabat sine cornibus ullis 615
> Iuppiter inque deum de bove versus erat.
> taurus init caelum: te, Sidoni, Iuppiter implet,
> parsque tuum terrae tertia nomen habet.

> As a bull Jupiter presented his back to the girl from Tyre and wore horns on a counterfeit forehead. She grasped his mane with her right hand and her clothing with her left hand, and her very fear added to her attractiveness. The breeze made her dress at her breasts billow, the breeze stirred her blond hair: like that, girl from Sidon, you were a sight for Jupiter's eyes. Often she pulled back her girlish feet from the sea, fearing the touch of the water that jumped at her. Often the god deliberately plunged his back into the waves, so she would cling more firmly to his neck. When the shore was reached, Jupiter stood there without any horns, having changed from a bull to a god. The bull enters the sky; Jupiter fills you, girl from Sidon, and a third of the earth bears your name.

There Ovid opens at a much later point than he does in the *Met.*, and such aperture is variously effective.[13] There is also divergent closure. In the *Metamorphoses* the ending is tricky and teasingly unsatisfying. When book 2 concludes with Europa at sea on the bull, her clothing billowing in the wind, many readers will infer that with the end of the book the story is over and will feel a sense of anticlimax (expectations of a description of the rape as the next step after the gradual and titillating build up to the abduction are frustrated). However, the narrative resumes at the start of book 3, but only to peter out after a few more lines (with the rape still not described) and blur into the story of Cadmus, as the search for Europa is abandoned.[14] By way of contrast in the *Fasti* there is a tidy ending, with a satisfying sense of closure: the story is completed (with rape and recompense recounted), the promised *aetion* is duly supplied, and there is ring-structure.[15] Although, typically, there is a surprise in the immediately following couplet (6.619f.) which suddenly undercuts that ending somewhat: just when we thought the aetiology was over, Ovid adds an extra explanation (others think that the Bull is the bovine Io).[16]

---

[13] See p. 214.

Something else that distinguishes the two versions is the closer engagement with the model in *F.* 5.605ff. At Moschus *Europa* 126ff. the heroine at sea on the bull 'held on with one hand to the bull's long horn, and with the other pulled up the purple fold of her robe, so it would not get wet trailing in the vast and hoary sea; and the robe of Europa billowed right out about her shoulders.' At *Met.* 2.874f. she holds on to the bull's horn with one hand and puts the other hand on its back, as her clothes billow. Slightly nearer to Moschus, at *F.* 5.607ff. she holds the bull's mane in one hand and her dress in the other, while her clothes billow. But, more significantly, in the *Fasti* our inventive poet really builds on the heroine's inappropriate concern for her dress in Moschus, turning it into a comically fastidious fear that her feet might get wet, which leads her at 611f. into an ungainly perch hard to maintain (hence *saepe* 'often'), and which is craftily exploited by Jupiter in 613f.

There is more to amuse readers in the lines from the *Fasti*. In fact they amount to a tour de force in concentrated wit, again in contrast to the much longer passage in the *Met.*, where there is humour,[17] but a more diffuse and leisurely humour. So there is also irony in the *Fasti* version: for example, in 611 Europa shrinks back from the sea when, if anything, she should have shrunk from the bull and jumped into the sea and swam off; in 612 she fears the touch of the water while she is touching her rapist, from whom she has much more to fear; and in 614 she holds on tightly for safety to her abductor. There is also verbal play (with double entendre easily felt in this erotic context). In 605 there seems to be a pun in *praebere tergum*, which primarily denotes the offering of the back for Europa but can also mean 'take to flight'.[18] With Europa's inappropriate fear in 612 there may well be a hint that it will be the god who 'jumps' at her and who will 'touch' her sexually.[19] Sport with the erotic sense of *haereo* 'cling'[20] in 614 probably gives that line added bite. In 615, when Jupiter is about to rape his victim, *stabat* 'stood' could also encompass 'was erect'.[21] In 617, now that Jupiter is obviously in the process of assaulting the heroine, *taurus init* ('the bull enters') might well have *puellam* 'the girl' as its object[22] (*taurus init caelum* is a rather odd expression, employed here, I strongly suspect, specifically to allow this play on words). Reinforcing that, soon after in the same line the graphic *implet* 'fills' suggests filling with a penis and semen as well as with a foetus.

---

[14] Cf. WHEELER 1999 89ff. and FOWLER 2000 258f. on closure here.

[15] Metamorphosis of Jupiter in 615f. and 605f.; *taurus*, Europa denoted by geographical allusion and *Iuppiter* in 617 and 605f.

[16] Other noteworthy examples of variation in aperture and closure occur in connection with Persephone (*F.* 4.419ff., *Met.* 5.346ff.), Ino (*F.* 6.485ff., *Met.* 4.416ff.) and Hippolytus (*F.* 6.757ff., *Met.* 15.534ff.).

[17] See e.g. STIRRUP, MACK 100ff., ANDERSON 333ff.

The lines at *Met.* 2.836ff. are often stylish, as one would expect from Ovid, but again concentration makes the difference, and the *Fasti* account has so much packed in within a narrow compass that it can reasonably be characterized as a jewelled miniature, as a rapid survey of only the most striking points of style will show. In its opening couplet the phrase *Tyriae . . . puellae* (= Europa) enfolds *sua terga* (= the bull's back) and is itself embraced by Jupiter (*taurus* and *Iuppiter*); and there are also the suggestive collocations of girl and god (*puellae/Iuppiter*) and horns and forehead (*cornua fronte*). In 607 the grouping *iubam dextra, laeva* ('mane with her right hand, with her left hand') juxtaposes two juxtapositions. Victim and rapist are in tension at either end of 610. There is anaphora and antithesis in 611 and 613, chiasmus of Jupiter and bull in 616f., and expressive placement of Europa right next to the god in 617. The lines are also generally musical, with alliteration, assonance and homoeoteleuton especially noteworthy in 605, 611 and 617f.[23]

---

[18] See *OLD* s.v. *tergum* 4b.

[19] Cf. ADAMS 206 (on *salio* 'jump') and 185f. (on *tango* 'touch').

[20] See ADAMS 181f.

[21] For the verb in connection with erection cf. e.g. Hor. *Epod.* 12.19, Mart. 2.45.1, 3.73.2, Apul. *Met.* 2.7.

[22] *Ineo* is often used of copulating animals (*OLD* s.v. 3).

[23] Arachne depicted Europa in her weaving at *Met.* 6.103–7, where Ovid produces an even briefer version and reduces the story to abduction alone. There is no humour in those lines, which present an actual ecphrasis rather than pictorial description, and which have added complexity (in that shortly after them Arachne becomes a victim of heaven herself).

The coda also plays a significant role in differentiation. In both the *Fasti* and the *Metamorphoses* the narratives of the apotheosis of Ino and of Romulus conclude in a very similar way, but in each case the epic has an extra incident by way of a coda. At *F.* 6.485ff. the tale of Ino's persecution by Juno for bringing up Jupiter's bastard son Bacchus terminates triumphantly with the deification of Ino and her son after she jumped into the sea with him, driven mad by Juno. Ino's own story in *Met.* 4.416ff. has the same kind of ending at 531–42, when Venus pities Ino for the suffering imposed on her by Juno and gets Neptune to turn the mother and child into gods after her leap into the waves. But then (at 543–62) Ovid goes on to relate how Ino's companions arrived at the cliff where she jumped, assumed that she had died and mourned her deeply, criticizing Juno for her cruel treatment of Ino; that caused an enraged Juno to make them the greatest memorials of her cruelty, and even as they grieved she transformed them into rock and birds. That addendum makes for false closure, as most readers will have assumed that the section on Ino was over with her apotheosis, and this (unparalleled) extra incident must have been Ovid's own invention or a rarity. It also injects some convolution and a certain strangeness absent from the *Fasti* doublet by means of a distorted replay of preceding events: one of the companions tries to leap from the cliff as Ino had done but is stopped on the point of jumping by being turned to rock; again humans are divinely metamorphosed, but into stone and birds, not gods; once more Juno punishes the enemy, but this time her punishment is not undone. In particular, this bitter and dispiriting coda, in line with the darker opening to the Ino story in the *Met.*,[24] makes for a completely different overall flavour: the triumphant apotheosis is here immediately and lengthily undermined, as we are taken from deification to transmogrification into stone and birds, and from a thwarted Juno to a dominant Juno harshly reasserting herself, and we go away with the grimly graphic picture of rocks like humans fixed in gestures of mourning high up on the cliff top and birds which used to be humans skimming the water below, all parted forever from their dear friend Ino.

---

[24] Contrary to the *Fasti*, it emphasizes Juno's rage, the Underworld and the maddening of Ino and her husband.

With various verbal similarities,[25] both *F.* 2.481ff. and *Met.* 14.805–28 open with a speech by Mars which wins Jupiter's assent to Romulus' translation to heaven and then move on to the disappearance of the Roman king (carried off by Mars' chariot) and his metamorphosis into a deity. But in the *Met.* that is followed by a section of almost as many lines (829–51) on Romulus' wife Hersilia. There Juno orders Iris to go and tell Hersilia to stop crying and follow her to the Quirinal if she wants to see her husband; Hersilia readily agrees, begging Iris to show her Romulus, and goes off with her; a star glides down and Hersilia, her hair blazing with its light, mounts to heaven with it; there she is welcomed by Romulus (Quirinus), who changes her into a goddess. Again the (unparalleled) coda effects false closure, but this time it has clear and extensive links with the ending of *F.* 2.481ff. and there is inversion. In the *Fasti* (2.497ff.) after Romulus disappeared there was general grief and a god (Quirinus) appeared to a man called Julius Proculus, told him to forbid the Romans to mourn and then moved on to the public business of his worship and their military skills. In the *Met.* (14.829ff.) after Romulus disappeared Hersilia grieved and a goddess appeared to the woman, told her not to mourn and then moved on to the private business of reunion with her husband. In the *Fasti* the human addressee complied, spoke to the Romans and (staying on earth) thus instigated the temple and rites for Quirinus. In the *Met.* the human addressee complied, spoke to the goddess and (after rising to heaven) was made into a goddess by Quirinus (again the divine figures, but on a personal rather than public level). So too both groups of lines are concerned with apotheosis, but whereas the *Fasti* is concerned solely with Romulus and ends with him deified, the *Met.* is concerned with Hersilia too and ends with her deified.[26]

Although I am generally very cautious about assigning priority in connection with two poems composed at about the same time, in this case it strikes me as very likely that in the *Met.* Ovid was topping (and so varying in yet another way) his own earlier lines in the *Fasti*. Although the elegiac passage performs its function well enough and may have hidden point,[27] it can hardly be seen as improving on the epic one or effectively tricking by frustrating expectations based on that. But the addendum in the *Metamorphoses* has in place of the well-known Proculus incident[28] the rare or unique apotheosis of Hersilia, which represents an extra deification, is far more marvellous than anything in the account in the *Fasti* and depicts Romulus not just as a god but transforming another into a god as well. The coda also has a neat parallelism not found in the *Fasti* (Hersilia goes up to heaven with a star as her husband had on a chariot, and two goddesses were behind her ascent as two gods were behind his).[29]

---

[25] Cf. e.g. *F.* 2.487–9 with *Met.* 14.814–6.

[26] These differences may have been delicately foreshadowed in the designation of Romulus as he was carried off by Mars' chariot. At *Met.* 14.824 he is *Iliades* ('son of Ilia'), which shortly prior to Hersilia contains reference to another woman close to him who became a goddess; at *F.* 2.496 he is *rex* ('king'), which contains no female allusion and stresses his regal function prior to his orders for Proculus and concern for his people. HEINZE 320 and 326f. points to epic elements in the *Met.* doublet but fails to note that the coda puts the emphasis on the female rather than the male, and on love rather than war and affairs of state.

Sometimes variety is achieved by means of the amount of colour injected, as is well demonstrated by the Marsyas doublet. Ovid tells the story vividly at *Met.* 6.383ff.:

satyri reminiscitur alter,
quem Tritoniaca Latous harundine victum
adfecit poena. 'quid me mihi detrahis?' inquit; 385
'a! piget, a! non est' clamabat 'tibia tanti!'
clamanti cutis est summos direpta per artus,
nec quicquam nisi vulnus erat; cruor undique manat
detectique patent nervi trepidaeque sine ulla
pelle micant venae; salientia viscera possis 390
et perlucentes numerare in pectore fibras.
illum ruricolae, silvarum numina, Fauni
et satyri fratres et tunc quoque carus Olympus
et nymphae flerunt, et quisquis montibus illis
lanigerosque greges armentaque bucera pavit. 395
fertilis inmaduit madefactaque terra caducas
concepit lacrimas ac venis perbibit imis;

---

[27] See BARCHIESI 112ff.

[28] See e.g. FRAZER II 422.

[29] So too in the earlier lines at *Met.* 14.819ff. the description of Mars' journey by chariot and the removal of Romulus' mortal part are more vivid than anything in the elegiac work. And if the *Met.* passage followed the *Fasti* one, there would be extra cleverness in the quote from Ennius at *Met.* 14.814. There and at *F.* 2.487 Mars reminds Jupiter that he had said to him *unus erit, quem tu tolles in caerula caeli* ('there is one who you will raise to the blue heavens') with reference to Romulus. CONTE 57ff. suggests that Mars remembers the words because he had heard them in Ennius' *Annals*, but the double reference to memory in *memoro memorique* at *Met.* 14.813 (not found in the *Fasti*) would have particular point if Mars was remembering the line from the *Annals* and also from the *Fasti*.

> quas ubi fecit aquam, vacuas emisit in auras.
> inde petens rapidum ripis declivibus aequor
> Marsya nomen habet, Phrygiae liquidissimus amnis. 400

> Another remembered the Satyr who Apollo beat in a contest with Minerva's reed-pipes and punished. 'Why are you tearing me away from myself?' he said. 'Ah, I'm sorry!' he shouted. 'Ah, the flute is not worth this!' As he shouted, the skin was stripped from the surface of his limbs, and he was nothing but wound. Blood flowed everywhere, the sinews were uncovered and laid bare, and the veins without any skin pulsed and throbbed. You could count his quivering organs and the glistening tissues in his chest. The Fauns, those gods of the woods who live in the countryside, and his brother Satyrs and Olympus (who he loved even then) and the nymphs wept for him, and so did everyone who pastured woolly flocks and horned herds on those mountains. The fertile earth was soaked and sodden, absorbed the falling tears and drank them down deeply in its veins. It turned them into water, which it sent out into the empty air. Rushing from there within shelving banks down to the sea, the river is called Marsyas and is the clearest in Phrygia.

Those lines are full of horror, pathos and marvel.[30] By way of complete contrast the version at *F.* 6.697ff.[31] is colourless and really pales in comparison with that of the *Metamorphoses* (for text and translation see p. 61; and note that there the flaying is covered in just one line and there is nothing on the mourning or the creation of the river). The account in the *Fasti* is put in the mouth of Minerva, who has been asked by Ovid to explain the origin of the name of a festival of hers, but who talks instead of her invention of the flute and then rambles off to Marsyas and never does answer the question.[32] There is a mirror effect, as the story of Marsyas is cut short and is unsatisfactory, just like her explanation of the festival's name. There is skimming (of the contest) in the *Metamorphoses*, but that gets us quickly into the more emotive part of the tale, whereas in the *Fasti*, after leading us to expect a description of the punishment at least, the goddess glosses over the most sensational bit of the story. Minerva is not only inadequate in her response to Ovid's question she is an inadequate narrator (if she had to go on about Marsyas, she might at least have made a good job of it). All of this, I believe, is a bold experiment. Ovid has produced a deliberately insipid narrative (almost an anti-narrative), but one which (as well as not going on for too long) still engages and has point. For one thing there is irreverent humour: the goddess of wisdom is here an incompetent informant, and this divinity who is associated with poetry[33] and who is talking of events connected with herself and her invention (the flute) simply does not measure up to Ovid. Then there is *F.* 6.701, where Minerva reports that after she had seen her face disfigured by playing the flute she threw it away, remarking *ars mihi non tanti est; valeas, mea tibia* ('art is not worth that much to me; goodbye, my flute'). In the midst of such a narrative the dismissiveness here can easily be seen to apply to the art of story-telling as well as that of flute-playing. There also seems to be a clear echo of a line in Ovid's *Ars Amatoria* (3.505, where in the same situation Minerva said *i procul hinc . . . non es mihi, tibia, tanti* 'go far away from here . . . you are not worth that much to me, flute'). The most striking difference is in art rather than the flute being not worth that much in the *Fasti*, and *ars* (at the start of the line) looks like an allusion to the earlier occurrence of these words in the *Ars*.[34] There is also play with that line from the *A.A.* in *Met.* 6.386, where that same phrase is assigned to Marsyas, pointedly, whether Ovid is there correcting himself (= actually it was Marsyas who said this) or intimating that Marsyas took over Minerva's words along with her flute and repeated them with a much darker twist.

---

[30] For more on the impact of the lines see TISSOL 1997 125ff.

[31] It may not be simply coincidental that both passages appear in the sixth book of their poem. So too the Callisto story appears in the same book of the *Fasti* (2.155ff.) and *Met.* (2.401ff.).

[32] See pp. 61f.

Ovid also distinguishes doublets by means of the relative complexity of each of the two narratives. Simplicity can be effective, as is shown by *F.* 2.155ff. on the rape of the nymph Callisto. Scholars have contrasted that account with the one at *Met.* 2.401ff., pointing out that the epic is more full and detailed.[35] But none has seen that what we have in the *Fasti* is a shorter passage with a correspondingly more intense impact and an intentionally stark and spare narrative which allows the inherent pathos of the events to come across undiluted.[36] In contrast to the stripped down, humourless[37] rendering in elegiacs, the epic goes for more elaborate episodes and a tonal mixture (some pathos, but also irony, wit, sensationalism, horror etc.) which diminishes and distracts from the essential poignancy of the story. The brevity of parallel items in the *Fasti* in particular brings out the different qualities of the two passages and the force of the unvarnished version. In the *Fasti* Callisto is raped after swearing an oath to remain a virgin, and the actual assault occupies only half of a single line (2.162: *cavit mortales, de Iove crimen habet* 'she stayed away from mortals, became culpable thanks to Jupiter'). In contrast to the succinct conveyal of the bare fact (and the nymph's tragic culpability) there, at *Met.* 2.417–40 the attack is developed into a major incident which is affecting at the end (434ff.), but which before that has a distinctly humorous and sensuous side (as the rapist disguises himself as the virginal Diana, Jupiter gets into drag and in female guise kisses the female Callisto passionately). In the *Fasti* the actual metamorphosis of the nymph into a bear (by the enraged Juno) is covered baldly in half a line (2.177); in the *Met.* 13 lines are dedicated to that (2.476–88), there is more horror than pathos there, and there is also some undercutting irony (in 483f. her voice as a bear is said to be *minax* and *plena terroris*, but she is hardly threatening or terrifying really, certainly not to Juno, and in fact Callisto would be the one experiencing terror). While a couplet is sufficient to get across Callisto's sufferings as a bear at *F.* 2.181f., they take up seven lines at *Met.* 2.489–95 and are there accompanied by much dark humour and wit.[38] After the nymph's ordeal was ended by stellification, again a single couplet (2.191f.) covers concisely and adequately the unrelenting Juno's dispiriting request to Tethys not to allow Callisto in star form to set in her water; at *Met.* 2.508–31 an extended speech by Juno does certainly highlight her wrath but at such great length that the focus shifts from Callisto, and again there is levity as Juno in yet another rant (cf. 2.471ff.) goes over the top.[39] In fact this whole process had started much earlier. The epic account begins with a light and leisurely bridge passage, but in the *Fasti* Ovid gets right into the story from the start, depicting (at 2.155f.) the companions and way of life that the nymph will soon tragically lose, and then (at 2.157ff.) foregrounding something not found in the epic—the vow by Callisto to remain a virgin and Diana's promise of pre-eminence if she keeps her word (so that we will feel sympathy when we see her own good intentions leading to her downfall, as she is deprived through no fault of her own of her prized virginity and the promised pre-eminence).[40]

---

[33] Cf. e.g. *F.* 3.833f.

[34] Although it is possible that Ovid was working on parts of the *F.* prior to *A.A.* 3, this clever cross-reference suggests to me that this particular *F.* passage was composed after the *A.A.* 3 lines. In any case, with this instance and the other links between the two poems discussed below, the *Fasti* would ultimately have been published after the *Ars*, so that readers would have looked back to the *A.A.* and perceived references back to it in the *Fasti*.

[35] See e.g. HEINZE 349f., LE BONNIEC 1969 32ff., FRÉCAUT 295f., NEWLANDS 157, JOHNSON and GEE 175ff.

---

[36] JOHNSON 19ff. comes closest to seeing this. He talks (but without expansion) of the *Fasti* passage being no fun and lacking diversions and entertainments; he also claims that it puts the stress on ugliness and unpleasantness (but those elements are hardly brought out, whereas pathos certainly is).

[37] The nearest thing to humour is the bitterly cynical *F.* 2.180.

[38] In 489, 492, 493, 494 and 495.

[39] Cf. OTIS 119 and ANDERSON 294ff.

The epic depiction of the rape of Persephone is a good illustration of the effectiveness of complexity, which there makes for an involving richness and ties in suggestively with characterization. At *F.* 4.417ff. Persephone's story is included as an appropriate decoration for Ovid's lines on the games of Ceres, and in it he keeps quite a close focus on the abduction of the girl and Ceres' search with a straightforward plot line (he does make much of the Celeus episode, but that is highly functional: see pp. 162f.). The narrative at *Met.* 5.346ff. is loosely expansive and intricate.

The elegiac version just begins with Ceres departing for a festival and leaving behind her daughter, who goes off to pick flowers and is then abducted; but the *Metamorphoses* provides quite elaborate context and motivation, making the rape part of a larger whole (it is motivated by Venus, who is concerned over her prerogatives and feels slighted by virgins such as Persephone). On top of that, in contrast to the simple, free-standing illustrative tale in the *Fasti*, in the epic the rape is only part of a song by Calliope about Ceres (5.341–661), and that song is just part of the contest between the Muses and the Pierides, and the report of that contest is just part of a conversation between the Muses and Minerva on Mount Helicon (5.250–678). So the epic rape is a story within a story.

It also contains other stories within itself (ones not found in the *Fasti*). The first of these concerns Cyane, a water nymph who tried to stop Dis carrying off Persephone but was contemptuously bypassed by him, with the result that she dissolved into tears and flowed into her own pool. Next, when Ceres, parched in her search for her daughter, began to drain a drink given her by an old woman, she was called greedy by a rude boy, so she angrily threw the water and barley drink into his face and changed him into a lizard. Much later, when it is agreed that Persephone can return if she has eaten nothing in the Underworld, Ascalaphus (the son of a nether nymph) tells about the pomegranate seeds that she devoured, so in rage she hurls water from the Phlegethon into his face and changes him into an owl. Then we are told that Persephone's companions had searched unsuccessfully for her through all lands and prayed that they could acquire wings so that they could scour the sea, and as a result the gods gave them plumage and transformed them into the Sirens. These secondary tales are peripheral and could easily have been skimmed or omitted, but Ovid develops them at length. Metamorphosis figures in them all, which is apt for the *Metamorphoses* and also appropriate because in including them Ovid is transforming his model, *Homeric Hymn* 2,[41] which did not have them.

---

[40] Differences of tone are also evident in the pairs concerning Hippolytus, Ino and Persephone. As a further show of virtuosity Ovid here also manages the renarration without repeating a single line, half line or phrase (BÖMER II 94 claims that there are clear verbal echoes, but there are in fact no exact parallels in the lines which he cites).

Those stories are adroitly linked with the frame narrative (the lines surrounding the rape). Ascalaphus' mutation into an owl and the acquisition of plumage by Persephone's friends mirror 5.288, where the Muses don wings, and 5.699ff., where the Pierides are changed into magpies. And Cyane turns to water after male maltreatment, just as Arethusa will at 5.632ff., and the offended Ceres transmogrifies the rude boy, just as she will Lycus at 5.659ff. There are also internal links within those secondary tales. Water plays a part in all of them. For ill-chosen words the rude boy and Ascalaphus are transformed by water tossed into their faces by Ceres and her daughter; Cyane changed into water, and Persephone's companions prayed for wings so they could fly over water. Also two of the metamorphoses concern males and two concern females, and there is a chiastic ordering of female and male mutants.

The epic narrative is complex and expansive partly because of its narrator. In the *Fasti* Ovid is embellishing a genial festival of the bountiful and kindly Ceres (a sympathetic figure who appears as similarly sympathetic in the story of the rape). In the *Metamorphoses* the tale is recounted by Calliope in the song-contest with the Pierides (loud-mouthed humans who presumptuously challenged the Muses, came out with an insolent song belittling the deeds of the gods, lost the contest and were changed into magpies as punishment by the angry Muses, whose patience was not limitless).[42] Such being the case, the thrust of Calliope's song is understandable and has real bite. She depicts a similarly impatient and vengeful Ceres who also metamorphoses an offensive human (the rude boy) in punishment, allowing her own feelings to affect her depiction of Ceres and projecting some of herself into her,[43] and also fashioning Ceres so as to show the Pierides the power of divinity and prefigure retribution. So too with Cyane, Ascalaphus and the Sirens she again lingers over metamorphosis (brought about by the gods and involving mutation into birds in the last two cases and done in revenge to the loud-mouthed Ascalaphus). Calliope is packing in the cautionary tales and using similar stories for reinforcement, as she dwells, savours and gloats over what is coming to the Pierides.[44]

---

[41] For that as Ovid's model see HINDS 1987b 72ff.

The darker protagonist represents yet another form of differentiation in these doublets. In contrast to the Ceres of the *Fasti*, the goddess of the *Metamorphoses* is more vengeful and less sympathetic,[45] and an angry figure rather than a sorrowing mother.[46] This difference is made particularly clear by the extensive contrast between two parallel incidents. At *F.* 4.509ff. and *Met.* 5.446ff., shortly after kindling two pine torches and wandering far and wide on a fruitless quest for her abducted daughter, Ceres receives hospitality at a small hut in the country. In the *Fasti* this is the home of Celeus (he has a sick son whom the goddess heals, and she later tries to purge the boy's humanity in the fire and make him a god, until his mother stops her, thinking that he is being harmed). Ceres there comes across as a gentle character.[47] In the *Met.* the hut belongs to an old woman who is the mother of the rude boy who insults the goddess, and there Ceres appears much less caring. Ceres in the epic is thirsty and asks for a drink; in the elegiac passage she is so distraught with grief that she refuses food. In the *Met.* she has no patience with the stupid boy; in the *Fasti* she is understanding when the mother foolishly intervenes. The epic Ceres changes the son into a lizard; the elegiac Ceres saves the son's life and would have transformed him into a god. In the episode in the *Metamorphoses* the goddess causes the separation of the boy from his mother (the lizard flees) and makes her cry; in the *Fasti* she prevents the boy from being lost to death and overjoys the mother and everybody else in the family.

---

[42] See 5.503ff., 665ff.

[43] Cf. ANDERSON 526f.

[44] Note also that this tale of presumption and chastisement is related to Minerva, who will shortly be engaged in a contest with the arrogant Arachne, and that girl will depict deities in a bad light (in her weaving) and will be punished with metamorphosis.

[45] Cf. ANDERSON 526f., 550, 557.

[46] Cf. HEINZE 309f., HINDS 104ff.

[47] See p. 162.

Internal Self-Reference

There are numerous links between lines and passages within the *Fasti*, in the form of repetition of diction, echoes of plot and incident, retelling of whole stories or types of tale and so on. Some of these examples of self-reference could be accidental and might have been eliminated in a final revision; but overall there are so many instances and they are often so substantial and striking that it is clear that this is in the main an intentional process. Specific cases are discussed elsewhere in this book—the very similar but still distinct rape narratives concerning Lotis and Vesta; the contradictory Ino tales; the reprise of the birth, exposure and rescue of Romulus and Remus; the reminiscence with capping of the Aristaeus passage (1.363ff.) at 3.289ff.; ringing the changes with recurring characters; and redeployment of phraseology.[48] This section will look briefly at the broader picture.

These internal links are used as a structural device to pull together all six books, to establish two groups of three books each, and to set up patterns. The following remarks concentrate on the most conspicuous examples uncovered by my research, but there are various minor correspondences as well.[49] In each book there is at least one passage for which there is a doublet in the *Metamorphoses* and at least one rape narrative,[50] so these act as linking threads for 1–6. The accounts of the assaults on Lotis (1.393ff.) and Vesta (6.321ff.) are very close and form a ring within the first six books.[51] Self-reference also draws together 1, 2 and 3. The episode of the rape of the Sabine Women and the ensuing war (not mentioned in 4–6) is related (with stress on different parts) at 1.259ff., 2.429ff. and 3.179ff.; the birth and unsuccessful exposure of Romulus and Remus is told at 2.383ff., 3.11ff. and 3.49ff.; the Aristaeus story of 1.363ff. is recalled at 3.289ff. Ovid also creates a balancing group of three books (4–6) in this way. The foundation of Rome and death of Remus at 4.809ff. are resumed with Remus' viewpoint at 5.451ff. Pairs of narratives in close succession concerning recurring characters (sexually assaulted nymphs) occur at 5.195ff. and 231ff. (Flora) and 6.105ff. and 131ff. (Cranae). There is also extensive verbal parallelism: Remus and Tullius are murdered with the result that another becomes king of Rome at 4.844 *ille premit duram sanguinulentus humum* ('covered with blood, he sank down on the hard ground') and 6.602 *concidit in dura sanguinulentus humo* ('covered with blood, he fell on the hard ground'); and (of a goddess each time) 4.586 *in voltu signa dolentis erant* ('in her face there were signs of her sorrow') is taken up at 6.66 *in voltu signa vigoris erant* ('in her face there were signs of vigour'). Finally, the two Ino passages (3.853ff., 6.485ff.) are arrestingly connected via contradiction, so that there is a tie between the last book of 1–3 and the last book of 4–6.

---

[48] See pp. 81ff., 140, 147ff., 150f., 179f. and the section on redeployment of phraseology below.

[49] On the considered overall structure of the *Fasti* see esp. BRAUN and NAGLE 6ff. My findings supplement their observations.

[50] See the previous section and chapter 3.

[51] See further HOLZBERG 177.

Reprise of an Incident

Ovid in *Heroides* 9[52] has Deianira complain to Hercules at 53–118 about an incident that she has recently heard of—his exchange of attire with queen Omphale. Deianira lists various achievements by the great hero and reproaches him for lowering himself by dressing as a woman, and also spinning, and telling of his exploits while so clad and employed, and letting Omphale conquer him and take as spoil his lion-skin and weapons. At *Fasti* 2.305ff. Ovid subsequently reverts to the cross-dressing incident. He tells how Faunus one day caught sight of Hercules and Omphale and became so attracted to her that he later entered the cave where they were spending the night with the intention of raping her. However, he did not know that the hero and the queen had meanwhile exchanged clothing and, while groping around in the dark, he recoiled from the lion-skin (which was in fact worn by Omphale), then found the soft woman's clothing (on Hercules) and so climbed on to the hero's bed and began a sexual assault on him, only to be flung out of bed, to the great amusement of the hero and the company. The change of attire is related at 2.317ff.:

---

[52] On the genuineness of *Her.* 9 see JACOBSON 228ff. and CASALI 227ff. The extensive engagement with *Her.* 9 noted in this section adds strong support for Ovidian authorship of the epistle.

> dumque parant epulas potandaque vina ministri,
>   cultibus Alciden instruit illa suis:
> dat tenues tunicas Gaetulo murice tinctas,
>   dat teretem zonam, qua modo cincta fuit. 320
> ventre minor zona est; tunicarum vincla relaxat,
>   ut posset magnas exseruisse manus.
> fregerat armillas non illa ad bracchia factas,
>   scindebant magni vincula parva pedes.
> ipsa capit clavamque gravem spoliumque leonis 325
>   conditaque in pharetra tela minora sua.

> While the servants were preparing a banquet and wine to drink, she dressed Hercules in her own finery. She gave him her gauzy tunic dyed with Gaetulian purple, she gave him the smooth girdle which she had just had round her. The girdle was too small for his stomach; she undid the tunic's clasps, so he could thrust his big hands out of it. He burst the bracelets which had not been made to fit those arms, his big feet split her tiny sandal-straps. She herself took his heavy club, the pelt stripped from the [Nemean] lion and the lesser weapons stored in his quiver.

There Ovid, who is famous for compressing others, compresses himself, reducing more than sixty lines in *Her.* 9 to ten, and keeping a sharp focus on what is relevant to his purposes this time—the swapping of garb alone. There are some correspondences in detail and diction,[53] to underline the link with *Heroides* 9 and encourage comparison, but more noteworthy is the variety achieved here. For example, the comic narrative in the *Fasti* is quite different from the primarily serious criticism of *Her.* 9.53ff. Ovid also seems to be making a variation on and correcting Deianira (i.e. himself) in the epistle: she (speculating) depicted Hercules as wearing bracelets and a girdle at 9.59 and 65f., but here Ovid (realistically) portrays them as too small for the huge hero. So too in both cases the cross-dressing looks forward to a mistake involving clothing, but whereas Deianira later sends Hercules the poisoned tunic that brings about the tragedy of his agony and death, in the *Fasti* the mix-up leads to the joke of Hercules almost being raped and to his laughter.[54] But most remarkable is the way in which Ovid skilfully redeploys this incident for multiple purposes, really putting it to work here. The exchange of clothing is given a new twist in the *Fasti* with its function of foiling Faunus. It is also intriguing: when it is highlighted by a full ten lines, the reader is led to wonder why and so is drawn into the story.[55] As well as playing a vital role in the plot (rather than just being part of a complaint), these ten lines also hold back the climax and so form part of the build-up to it. The eroticism here picks up Faunus' attraction to Omphale at the start of the narrative and looks forward to his aroused attempt at rape later. There is also foreshadowing in the humour (which prepares us for the humorous conclusion), and the removal of Omphale's tunic at 2.319 prefigures the lifting up of the tunic (on Hercules) by Faunus at 2.347, while the demeaning of the hero anticipates the demeaning of the god later. Finally, the cross-dressing which leads to Faunus' attempt on Hercules helps to make this rape narrative (out of the 31 in Ovid) rather different and quite memorable.[56]

---

[53] E.g. Omphale's *zona* (girdle) and bracelets, and Hercules' *clava* (club), lion-skin (referred to as *spolium/spolia leonis*) and *tela* (arrows). Compare also *F.* 2.339f. with *Her.* 9.111f.

Segmented Narration

Ovid produced five separate passages (*A.A.* 1.101ff., *F.* 1.259ff., 2.429ff., 3.179ff., *Met.* 14.775ff.) in which via segmented narration he told bit by bit the whole story of the rape of the Sabine women and the ensuing war and its resolution. He began in the *Ars* with the rape itself, but when he later returned to the Sabines he skimmed or totally omitted that and filled in the other parts of this episode. Inventive as ever, he constantly injected life into this old tale and did something different as he presented each of the segments.[57]

---

[54] For further differences see FANTHAM 1983 193f.

[55] No parallel exists for Faunus' attempted rape or for the connection of the clothing exchange with Faunus, so most if not all readers would be made curious here.

[56] Early on in this self-imitation Ovid includes a line (2.319) made up from phrases from two other authors (elsewhere we only find *tenues tunicas* at Virg. *G.* 2.75 and *Gaetulo murice tinctas* at Hor. *Epist.* 2.2.181). It may be significant that in this context of Hercules' acquiring another's clothes Ovid takes over others' words.

[57] Tantalizingly the promise of another rendition of the rape at *F.* 3.199f. was not kept. For segmented narration of the Ariadne story see pp. 263ff. Ovid also

Stress and tone vary, depending on the nature and aims of the passages and the works in which they figure. The *Ars* emphasizes the amatory side (concentrating on the rape), the trio in the *Fasti* have pronounced cultic and aetiological aspects, and the *Met.* highlights metamorphosis (of a cold spring into very hot water) and epic elements (such as the opposition between Venus and Juno).[58] The lines in the frivolous *A.A.* poke fun at Romulus and the Romans (see below); the passage in the epic poem is solemn and elevates Romulus;[59] and there is a tonal mixture in the *Fasti*, as a serious *aetion* is conveyed with humorous touches in all three cases.[60] Ovid also repeatedly changes the focus and presents a new or unusual spin. In the *Ars* he gives the merest hint of the cause of the rape (in 1.102), says nothing at all about its aftermath and concentrates on the actual abduction in the theatre, because the lines are intended to show that the theatre has been a good place for picking up girls ever since Romulus. The use of the rape as such an *aetion* seems to be novel, and so does the placing of the action in the theatre[61] and the irreverent dwelling on the early Romans' crudity, racing thoughts about the females prior to the rape and embarrassing problems with girls who resisted them. At *F.* 1.259ff. the spotlight is on Janus and just one incident—his prevention of the Sabines from taking the citadel during their war to get back their women—because the purpose is to explain the origin of the shrine given to Janus in thanks for that rescue. The god's intervention is attested only after Ovid,[62] and there is no parallel at all for Janus himself as the narrator of all this. *F.* 2.429ff. keep a tight focus on another segment (the general infertility of the abducted Sabines ended thanks to an oracle from Juno), again for aetiological purposes (Juno's advice initiated the custom of lashing women with strips of goat-hide to promote pregnancy). The infertility of the wives is seldom mentioned in surviving literature,[63] and Ovid may

---

fragments the tale of Ilia, but in that case simply tells two quite discrete parts of it in two different groups of lines (the rape by Mars at *F.* 3.11ff., and the subsequent claiming of her as a wife by Anio at *Am.* 3.6.45ff.).

[58] See HEINZE 333ff. for more of these elements.

[59] So the rape and the part played by Romulus' wife in ending the fighting are dropped, so as not to undercut Romulus (in contrast to *A.A.* 1.101ff. and *F.* 3.179ff.).

[60] Cf. pp. 34, 38f., 117f. and 146f.

[61] See WARDMAN. For more on the humour here see Watson in BOYD 2002 152ff.

[62] Macrobius and Servius make brief allusion to it: see FRAZER II 129.

[63] Cf. Servius on *Aen.* 8.343.

have been the first to point out (flippantly) that this made the famous rape a complete waste of time; this consultation of Juno and the (at first sight obscene!) oracle from her are unparalleled. By way of a change at *Fasti* 3.179ff. we find a survey of the whole episode put into the mouth of Mars, but only a partial one (this famous rapist here omits the rape, which he instigated: 3.197f.), and one which this time dwells on the cause of the seizure but devotes most space to the ending of hostilities when the Sabine women at the lead of Romulus' wife go between the two armies with their babies. Apparently new touches are the assignment of the narrative to Mars, the prominence given to Romulus' wife and the imaginative details of the babies (some of them under duress!) crying out to their grandfathers and being carried off in their shields. At *Met.* 14.775ff. there is a different version of the Sabines' assault on the citadel (foiled thanks to Venus and some nymphs, not Janus) and of the end of the war (where Romulus' wife does not figure). Those lines do not form an independent narrative but are just part of the preamble to the deification of Romulus. And there is no other extant account of such an intervention by these goddesses.

These five passages are connected in that they are all part of the same episode, but Ovid adds reinforcing links to remind us of the others as we read each passage, so that we cannot help but be aware of the segmented narration. For example, in addition to the fact that *F.* 1.259ff. and *Met.* 14.775ff. offer alternative depictions of the same incident, aetiology figures in the *Ars* and *Fasti* 1, 2 and 3; Juno appears in *Fasti* 1, 2 and 3 and also in *Met.* 14; and deities speak at *F.* 1.263ff., 2.441 and 3.179ff. Sometimes elements are picked up across segments in a particularly diverting way, as a few of the more noteworthy examples of this process will demonstrate. At *A.A.* 1.118 the (shouting) Roman men who fall on the helpless Sabine women are like wolves, while (tit for tat) at *Met.* 14.778 the (silent) Sabine men who are about to fall on the helpless Romans asleep on the citadel are also like wolves. At *A.A.* 1.123 during the rape one of the Sabine women calls to her mother ineffectually, and later at *F.* 3.221ff. the babies of the Sabine women call to their grandfathers (i.e. the fathers of the Sabine women) with great effect (bringing about the cessation of hostilities). *Fasti* 2.429ff. look back to the *Ars*: the Romans' lustful shouts at *A.A.* 1.115 prior to abducting the females are taken up by their king's frustrated shout at *F.* 2.431 after the abducted females turn out to be mainly infertile; at *A.A.* 1.111

an Etruscan flute-player helps facilitate the seizure (by providing the music for the dancer who distracts the Sabines), and at *F.* 2.433f. an Etruscan augur facilitates the fertility of the seized women (by interpreting Juno's obscure oracle); at *F.* 2.448 the Romans and Sabine girls become fathers and mothers, recalling the Roman's attempt to calm the worried girl at *A.A.* 1.130 by claiming that he will only be to her what her father is to her mother. *Fasti* 2.429ff. also looks forward to 3.179ff.: at 2.430 the females have few children (*pignora rara*), but by 3.218 they have lots of dear children (*pignora cara*); and at 2.438 the infertile wives and their husbands supplicate Juno for help by going down on their knees (*posito procubuere genu*), whereas at 3.220 the (now fertile) wives supplicate their husbands and fathers in the same way (*posito procubuere genu*). There is also play with narrators and addressees. In *Ars* 1, while narrating, Ovid apostrophizes the protagonist Romulus (who does not respond). At *Fasti* 1.257f. the poet talks to another protagonist (Janus), who this time does respond and in fact provides the narrative, and addresses the Romans (including Ovid) at 1.263. At *F.* 2.449ff., after narrating, Ovid speaks to Juno (who played an important role in the anecdote just related, and who does not answer). Next, at *F.* 3.167ff., the poet apostrophizes a character only loosely connected with the tale (Mars), but that character in reply takes over the narrative, addressing Ovid directly (and actually postponing the poet's account of the rape at 3.199f.) and also addressing another figure in the story (his son Romulus, at 195). At *Met.* 14.795, while telling the tale himself, Ovid apostrophizes an element in the story (water).

Redeployment of Phraseology

On a smaller scale we frequently find phrases, half-lines, full lines and even whole couplets repeated within the Ovidian oeuvre.[64] Some of these will have been re-used simply because Ovid liked them or was proud of them or because they formed handy metrical units, and in an author who wrote as much as Ovid did there may even be some unconscious echoes; but often enough there seems to be definite point in the reiteration and deliberate redeployment.[65] There is simply not the space here for a thorough investigation of this phenomenon, so I have selected for discussion in this section the most persuasive and interesting examples[66] and I leave others to do more work in this promising, if problematical, area.

---

[64] See the valuable list (with no real analysis) in GANZENMÜLLER.

At 2.311f. a parasol carried by Hercules keeps the sun's rays off Omphale. The detail of the lover holding up such a sun-shade for his mistress is elsewhere paralleled only in Ovid's own *A.A.* 2.209 (in a list of obsequious tasks to be performed for the girlfriend), and *umbracula* is used in the sense of 'parasol' first in those two Ovidian passages.[67] The reminiscence puts the great hero down on the level of the (weak, unmanly, inglorious) elegiac lover,[68] and the humour in that (reinforcing the basically funny picture of Hercules with sun-shade) leads in smoothly to the still more comic cross-dressing at 2.317ff. There may also be a (surreal) suggestion that Hercules had read and here implemented the advice in the *Ars*. There is a clever cross-reference too, as *A.A.* 2.209 comes not long before the mention (at 2.219ff.) of Hercules' obedience as Omphale's slave by way of justification for Ovid's reader acting in a servile role.

At *F.* 4.616 (in a narrative adorning a section on a festival of Ceres), after she has been promised that Persephone will be allowed to return from the Underworld for half of each year, the placated Ceres joyfully sets wreaths of corn ears on her hair (*imposuitque suae spicea serta comae*) and provides a bountiful harvest (*messis*) to end the famine that she had caused. This calls to mind *Am.* 3.10.36 (in a poem complaining about a festival of Ceres), where in the midst of Ceres' preoccupation on Crete with her beloved Iasius the wreaths of corn ears fall from her hair (*deciderant longae spicea serta comae*) and there is a general famine, except for Crete, which has a bountiful harvest (*messis*). Among the various twists most obviously the wreaths are placed on the goddess' hair rather than falling off it. With that detail Ovid is 'looking through' (himself!) to the model for *Am.* 3.10.36, namely Tibullus 1.10.22 *seu dederat sanctae spicea serta comae* (the only other extant instance of the collocation *spicea serta comae*), where Tibullus describes how in the past the household god was content with humble offerings and was appeased if somebody made an offering of grapes or put wreaths of corn ears on his hair. Having inverted that Tibullan line in *Am.* 3.10.36, Ovid in the *Fasti* reverts to Tibullus' placing of the wreaths on the divinity's hair and the divinity being placated.[69]

---

[65] A little work has also been done on this by McKEOWN (1987 110), MILLER (1991 22f., 29, 36ff., 63ff., 104, 133f.), WOYTEK (46ff.) and REESON (General Index s.v. Ovid reshapes own material), but they have left the field still wide open.

[66] Other instances have already been touched on in this chapter (see pp. 247f., 253 and 258), and still others are handled elsewhere in this book (for 2.782 see p. 168 n. 79; for 3.549f. see p. 213; for 4.520 see p. 80). I have also observed intriguing parallels, clever links and neat twists in connection with 1.367 (recalled at 1.480 and 6.154), 1.575 (echoes *Her.* 4.115), 2.176 (repeats *Am.* 3.4.22), 2.405 (cf. *Her.* 11.85), 4.264 (compare *Her.* 16.204) and 5.245 (picks up *Am.* 1.8.109 and perhaps *Her.* 5.121).

[67] Cf. JANKA 186.

[68] Cf. *dominae* 'mistress' of Omphale at *F.* 2.305, which combines the senses of 'female owner' and 'girlfriend' for Hercules.

At *Am.* 3.14.37f. (in a frivolous poem to his mistress objecting not to her being unfaithful but to her not concealing it from him) Ovid says: *mens abit et morior, quotiens peccasse fateris,/perque meos artus frigida gutta fluit* 'I lose my mind and die whenever you confess that you have been unfaithful, and a chilly sweat flows over my body'. At *F.* 2.753f. Lucretia voices her fears for her husband, who is away fighting, with the words: *mens abit et morior, quotiens pugnantis imago/ me subit, et gelidum pectora frigus habet* 'I lose my mind and die whenever the image of him fighting presents itself to me, and an icy chill possesses my breast'. That is a startling transference, from the perverse and raffish womanizer wryly complaining but actually condoning infidelity to the noble and chaste wife who loves her husband deeply and truly. I don't think that humour is intended here, because that would undercut the pathos in the poet's depiction of Lucretia[70] and undermine the impact of the coming rape of her by Sextus. Rather Ovid is trying (perhaps rather riskily) to increase sympathy for Lucretia: now we see these words sadly reapplied, to someone who (in contrast to the flippant poet of the *Amores*) has real grounds for complaint and is very upset, and someone who is separated from her husband in tense circumstances (unlike Ovid addressing his mistress at ease);[71] and the allusion to death and cold in Lucretia's case has real (tragic) point in view of her upcoming suicide (so at *Am.* 3.14.40 Ovid goes on to wish that he was dead, whereas Lucretia goes on to actually kill herself).[72]

---

[69] It may also be relevant that shortly after 1.10.22 Tibullus goes on to talk of his distaste for the Underworld and its absence of crops (at 35ff.).

[70] On which see pp. 197ff.

[71] Similar contrasts making for added pathos are activated by the echoing of *Am.* 3.4.22 (on Danae) at *F.* 2.176 (of Callisto). The latter resembles the former as a beautiful victim of Jupiter and so on, but things were even worse for Callisto (she wanted to remain a virgin herself, after conceiving she was harshly treated by two divinities not just by her father, so far from being rescued by her son she was nearly killed by him etc.).

The associations of an echo are also important at *F.* 3.645 but operate in a different way this time. There Anna flees in fear from her bedroom in Aeneas' home after Dido appears to her in a dream warning her of the danger to her there. Anna rushes along *tunica velata recincta* ('dressed in an ungirt tunic'), like a doe terrified by the howls of wolves, and in the very next couplet she is seized as his wife by the river god Numicius. The phrase quoted occurs elsewhere in Latin only twice, both times in Ovid, and the associations of those earlier occurrences prefigure what will shortly happen to Anna. At *Am.* 1.5.9 Corinna turned up in Ovid's bedroom *tunica velata recincta* (and was given a simile at 11f.) prior to having sex with him.[73] At *A.A.* 1.529 Ariadne (after Theseus had fled from her) awoke from sleep near water and was *tunica velata recincta* shortly before being carried off by Bacchus as his wife. Ariadne also felt fear and had nature similes applied to her to express her fear at 1.539 and 552ff.

Something similar, but far more ambitious and complex, occurs in some interlocked instances of self-imitation. Down to the Augustan period there are only four cases of phraseology combining *manus* ('hand'), *ferio* ('strike') and *pectora nuda* ('bare chest'). They appear in Ovid and involve pointed parallels and reversals. The first three are found in the *Fasti* and *Metamorphoses*. At *F.* 3.864 (*et ferit attonita pectora nuda manu*) Nephele strikes her bare chest with her stupefied hands as she sees her groaning children (Phrixus and the girl Helle) about to be sacrificed and go to the Underworld; shortly after this Nephele saves them, giving them the golden ram that takes them off to Colchis. At *F.* 4.454 (*et feriunt maesta pectora nuda manu*), when the companions of the abducted Persephone cannot find her anywhere, they strike their bare chests with sorrowing hands. By way of contrast to

---

[72] The associations from *Am* 3.14 of infidelity, concealment and revealment are also relevant, to the covert rape of Lucretia by the adulterous Sextus and the way in which through shame she can disclose to her husband and father only part of what has happened to her (*F.* 2.823ff.). It may also be pertinent that the husband and father condone her (forced) infidelity.

[73] Dido's sister Anna (= the goddess Anna Perenna) is thus equated with the elegiac mistress, which may well represent a witty inversion of elegy's comparison of the girlfriend to a heroine or divinity (for which see MURGATROYD 1980 175). At *F.* 3.645 and 647 *rapitur tunica* and *rapuisse Numicius* may also look to *deripuui tunicam* in *Am.* 1.5.13.

F. 3.864, they cannot see this girl, and she *has* gone to the Underworld. So too their hands are sorrowing rather than stupefied, but when Ceres turns up in 455 she is stupefied (*attonita*). Unlike Nephele, this mother cannot see or save her offspring. Persephone's companions also shout (*clamo*) for her at 452, which looks like a link with *Met.* 4.590 *nuda manu feriens exclamat pectora coniunx* ('the wife shouts out, striking her bare chest with her hands'). The subject there is Harmonia, the wife of Cadmus, who had fled from his own city and wandered far, and who for offending heaven by killing the serpent of Mars[74] was being turned into a snake himself; in tears, he had just addressed his wife, asking her to touch him. Like Nephele, this heroine can see her loved one as she grieves; and like Nephele's children Cadmus is upset himself. Like Ceres at this point, the wife can do nothing to help, and as Ceres went on to ask of her absent daughter *ubi es?* ('Where are you?') so Cadmus' wife goes on to say to him *ubi pes? ubi sunt . . . ?* ('Where is your foot? Where are . . .?'). The most obvious divergences are the absence of an epithet for *manus* and the different context in the *Metamorphoses*.

By the time that Ovid wrote the *Tristia* such phraseology had a rich complex of associations and a decidedly melancholy impact for alert and responsive readers. At *Tr.* 1.3.78 (*et feriunt maestae pectora nuda manus*) the sorrowing hands of his wife, friends and household strike their bare chests as the poet prepares to go off into exile. That line is closest to the two verses in the *Fasti*. These people's grief for Ovid thus assumes mythical proportions (it is as great as that of Nephele for her children, as great as that of the distraught companions for their Persephone). Ovid's suffering also has a mythological dimension. Like Phrixus and Helle, Ovid was about to make a long and dangerous journey to a remote and barbarous land. In common with Persephone, he was beyond the help of his friends and would soon be carried away out of sight to a dismal and hateful realm (to a living death).[75] There is also a clear connection with the epic hexameter. As there, it is Ovid's wife who is grieving for him (and she goes on to speak to him in the following lines), and she is agonized at the notion of separation and touches her husband, just like Harmonia. As was the case with Cadmus, Ovid is fleeing from his city and wandering far, has just tearfully addressed his wife and asked for contact, and has unwittingly offended a god. But among all the correspondences, at the time of writing the *Tristia* there were some dismal contrasts. Ovid had no Nephele to rescue him; and, whereas in the *Metamorphoses* Cadmus is united with Harmonia (who also changes into a snake) and the two live on together in a nearby wood, Ovid and his wife were far apart. It is also possible that at the back of his mind as he wrote this line Ovid was thinking that as a sort of Persephone he might eventually be recalled. We can't be sure, just as Ovid couldn't.

---

[74] See *Met.* 3.32, 4.571ff.

[75] Cf. *Tr.* 1.3.89ff.

Multiple Allusion

There is segmented narration of Ariadne's tale, with various parts of it caught and stressed in different works of Ovid. *Heroides* 10 presents her thoughts when abandoned by Theseus, before Bacchus turns up to claim her as his wife. *A.A.* 1.527ff. depict the abandonment and especially the advent of the god and his train. *Met.* 8.169ff. give an overview of events from the Minotaur being shut up in the Labyrinth to Bacchus' rescue of the heroine and the catasterism of her crown (with the latter element highlighted). *Fasti* 3.461ff. move beyond all that. There we find Ariadne happily married to Bacchus and wondering why she ever wept over Theseus' desertion, as everything finally went right for her. But then the god returns from his conquest of the Indians with a captive (a beautiful princess) to whom he is very attracted. In tears and dishevelled, Ariadne walks on a beach and comes out with a lengthy speech of lament and reproach about Bacchus' infidelity. At the end of this it is suddenly revealed that Bacchus heard what she said, as he was silently walking behind her all along. He kisses her tears away, transforms her into the goddess Libera and makes the gems in her crown into stars. As with the rape of the Sabine women discussed above, so with these segments Ovid gives a new spin each time. In *Her.* 10 he modifies his source (Catullus 64) by abbreviating it, turning it into a (begging) letter and suppressing the advent of Bacchus.[76] In the *Ars* there is reader deception and double allusion (with variation) to Catullus 64 and *Her.* 10.[77] He presents his shortest segment in the *Met.*, but there he still manages to

---

[76] See MURGATROYD 1994b 92 n. 4.

[77] See MURGATROYD 1994b.

cover more events than he does in any other segment, and he now makes the catasterism the main focus. In the *Fasti* he moves on to a sequel, which may well be his own invention (certainly there is no parallel for it), and in it he has Ariadne criticize the faithlessness of Bacchus this time and show fear of being left in the lurch again. There is as well echoing (with twists) not only of Catullus 64 and *Heroides* 10 but also of *A.A.* 1 and lines elsewhere in Ovid. So far scholars have picked up only a few of the Catullan references and none of the self-imitation.

At *F.* 3.469–75 Ariadne begins her complaint about Bacchus:

> flebat amans coniunx, spatiataque litore curvo
>   edidit incultis talia verba comis: 470
> 'en iterum, fluctus, similes audite querellas.
>   en iterum lacrimas accipe, harena, meas.
> dicebam, memini, 'periure et perfide Theseu!'
>   ille abiit, eadem crimina Bacchus habet.
> nunc quoque 'nulla viro' clamabo 'femina credat'; 475

> His loving wife wept, and as she paced the curving beach with dishevelled hair she spoke as follows: 'Come, waves, listen to a similar complaint yet again. Come, sand, receive my tears yet again. I used to say (I remember), 'Perjured and faithless Theseus!" He went away, Bacchus is open to the same accusation. Now too I will shout, "Let no woman trust a man."

There are obvious affinities there with Catullus 64.130–5 and 143f. (of Ariadne on the beach after Theseus' departure):

> atque haec extremis maestam dixisse querellis, 130
> frigidulos udo singultus ore cientem:
> 'sicine me patriis avectam, perfide, ab aris,
> perfide, deserto liquisti in litore, Theseu?
> sicine discedens neglecto numine divum,
> immemor a! devota domum periuria portas? 135

> nunc iam nulla viro iuranti femina credat,
> nulla viri speret sermones esse fideles.

> And sadly said this in her final complaint, emitting chill sobs, her face wet: 'Is this the way you've left me on a deserted beach after carrying me off from my ancestral altars, faithless, faithless Theseus? Is this the way you're departing, ignoring the will of the gods, with no thought for me, ah, carrying home your accursed perjury? . . . Now let no woman trust a man when he swears, let no woman expect a man's words to be reliable.

Conte observed that in the light of the Catullan allusion Ariadne's *memini* ('I remember') in *F.* 3.473 signals literary memory of her grief as Catullus' Ariadne, and the observation has now become celebrated.[78] However, it does not do full justice to the cleverness here, and much more remains to be said in connection with intertextuality. What Ariadne actually said at Cat. 64.132f. was *perfide . . . / perfide . . . Theseu*, not *periure et perfide Theseu*, as she claims at *F.* 3.473. Perhaps she has just not remembered her Catullan words all that well; perhaps she is mixed up and is combining *perfide Theseu* with *periuria* in Cat. 64.135 and/or *periuri viri* ('perjured man') at *Her.*10.76. In either case there is a joke in *memini*, as her memory is plainly at fault here. In addition, there are several more reminiscences of Catullus 64 at *F.* 3.461ff. For example, *audite querellas* (3.471) also occurs (in the same place in the line) at Cat. 64.195; *desertis . . . harenis* 'on the deserted sand' (3.479) recalls Cat. 64.133 *deserto in litore* 'on a deserted beach' (both phrases are used in connection with the abandoned Ariadne); and *amoribus . . . / coniugis* 'love of a spouse' (3.497f.) is also found at Cat. 64.182.[79] On top of that there are echoes of *Heroides* 10. For instance, Ovid uses the phrase *dedit fila* 'gave a thread' (of Ariadne's thread to guide Theseus) with a purpose expression at *F.* 3.462, as he did at *Her.* 10.72 and 103f.; the reference at *F.* 3.479 to the heroine's imminent death on the shore of Dia (with *morituram* 'about to die') calls to mind *Her.* 10.81ff. and 119; and at *F.* 3.503 Ariadne says to Bacchus *nec . . . mirum facis* 'you do nothing wonderful' (in inflaming her, as he was born from flames), just as she said to Theseus *non . . . miror* 'I do not wonder' and then went on to a similar conceit about his acts at *Her.* 10.105.[80] At the same time Ovid manages to work in references to the *Ars*: e.g. *F.* 3.464 *perfidus ille fuit* and 3.474 *ille abiit* look to *A.A.* 1.536 *perfidus ille abiit*; at *F.* 3.471 Ariadne complains to the waves, as she does elsewhere only at *A.A.* 1.531; and at *F.* 3.487 and 505 Bacchus criticizes Theseus for infidelity and promises her heaven as he does at *A.A.* 1.555 and 557 (only).[81]

---

[78] See CONTE 61f., and subsequently HINDS 1987a 17f., 1998 3f., LANDOLFI 139, SMITH 1997 9f., BARCHIESI 2001 18f. and Miller in BOYD 2002 177.

[79] Cf. also with 3.477 Cat. 64.171 (and *Her.* 10.77f.), with 3.485 Cat. 64.139ff., and with 3.506 Cat. 64.157.

[80] Compare also *F.* 3.461 with *Her.* 10.76; *F.* 3.463 with *Her.* 10.43 and 45 (and *A.A.* 1.533); *F.* 3.473 with *Her.* 10.92; and *F.* 3.475 with *Her.* 10.21 (and *A.A.* 1.531, 533). At *F.* 3.499ff. there is also sophistry by a female speaker typical of the *Heroides*.

[81] There are also echoes of the *Ars* at 3.463 (cf. *A.A.* 1.533); 3.469f. (cf. *A.A.* 1.526,

These allusions to preceding versions make for some clever play: in connection with 3.471f., as Ariadne complained and wept in Catullus, *Heroides* 10 and the *Ars*, there is real point to *iterum* ('yet again'); something similar happens in 3.486 (where she wonders how often she will repeat herself) and 3.490 (where she speaks of being deceived so often).[82] They help foreshadow the happy ending too, as they underscore the point that the heroine is here behaving exactly as she did over Theseus (and that incident finally turned out well thanks to Bacchus). They also depict an Ariadne who despite all her earlier literary experiences (and regardless of her claim of a good memory) apparently does not remember how Bacchus set things right for her in the past (and so may well do so here). In addition, the reminiscences drive home the fact that Ariadne's story has been told often before (and by Ovid himself), so that readers will appreciate all the more the novelty here, in the invention (it seems) of a sequel, in the triple allusion (improving on the double allusion in the *Ars* and so out-Oviding Ovid) and in a whole series of spins given to the preceding accounts.

Among these spins the heroine here for once criticizes someone who is actually present and hears her and she complains of his return (with a mistress) rather than his departure and of his love (for her rival) rather than his lack of love (for herself). She also reproaches herself for being upset about Theseus' treatment of her (as she was in Catullus 64, *Heroides* 10 and *A.A.* 1) because all turned out well eventually, and she does that (at 3.463f.) shortly before getting upset all over again about Bacchus' conduct towards her (which also comes right in the end). At 3.477ff. she regrets being saved from the very death that she feared and deprecated at Cat. 64.152f., 187 and *Her.* 10.81ff. At 3.479ff. she appeals to a divinity again (compare her words to Jupiter and the Eumenides about Theseus at Cat. 64.171ff., 192ff.), but this time she is appealing to her own husband, in connection with *his* misconduct, and she wants fidelity rather than revenge. The picture at 3.507f. of Bacchus being there all along, walking right behind the heroine without saying anything, looks like a neat turn to Cat. 64.251ff. and *A.A.* 1.537ff., where the god is only in the general vicinity and makes his way to her together with his noisy companions. And Bacchus here is transformed into someone less than trustworthy:

530, 532); 3.475 (cf. *A.A.* 1.531, 533); 3.511 (cf. *A.A.* 1.564); and 3.513 (cf. *A.A.* 1.558).

[82] Ovid may also intend us to see a continuous force to the imperfects in 3.473 and 480.

his claim at *A.A.* 1.555 that he would be faithful to her is undermined by his attraction to the foreign princess at 3.467f., and his promise at *A.A.* 1.557f. to set her in the sky as a star along with her crown would appear from 3.510ff. not to have been kept as yet.

As if all of that wasn't enough, as well as alluding to those three preceding narratives Ovid also recalls lines elsewhere in his earlier works. At *F.* 3.483 the heroine says to Bacchus: *ausus es ante oculos adducta paelice nostros* . . . ('Did you dare by bringing a mistress before my eyes . . .'), which is very close to *Her.* 9.121, where Deianira upbraids her husband Hercules for similarly returning with a king's daughter from a victorious campaign: *ante meos oculos adducitur advena paelex* ('A foreign mistress is brought before my eyes'). So the Ariadne of the *Fasti* is not only like the Ariadne of *Her.* 10 (etc.) she is also like Deianira of *Her.* 9 (but this 'Deianira' is harmless and amusing, her story has an upbeat ending, and she rather than her spouse is shortly deified). Next at *F.* 3.485 Ariadne asks: *heu ubi pacta fides? ubi quae iurare solebas?* ('Ah, where is the faithfulness you pledged? Where are the oaths that you used to swear?'), which is very like *Her.* 6.41, where Hypsipyle writes to her husband[83] Jason after hearing that he has returned from his successful expedition with the princess Medea: *heu ubi pacta fides? ubi conubialia iura* . . . ('Ah, where is the faithfulness you pledged? Where are the bonds of marriage . . .?'). So almost at once the versatile Ariadne metamorphoses into another female from the *Heroides* (but our Ariadne will be happily reunited with her husband, unlike Hypsipyle). The most startling and diverting change of all comes at *F.* 3.494, where Ariadne in the midst of her complaint about Bacchus' open infidelity says: *eveniat nostris hostibus ille color* ('may that complexion befall my enemies'). That recalls almost all of *Am.* 3.11.16, where Ovid in the midst of a complaint about his mistress' open infidelity says (of being seen at a disadvantage by his rival): *eveniat nostris hostibus ille pudor* ('may that embarrassment befall my enemies'). So now Ariadne is Ovid, and Ovid in the comically humiliating position of being seen waiting outside his girlfriend's door by his rival, as the man departs, worn out by love-making. One final point: that line in the *Amores* appears in a poem in which Ovid initially renounces love and criticizes his girl for being unfaithful, but then suddenly (at 33ff.) changes his mind and becomes reconciled to her; the volte-face at the end of the *Fasti* passage may thus be subtly prefigured.

---

[83] See *Her.* 6.41–6 for their marriage.

CHAPTER NINE

CLOSURE

Tomorrow is another day. Fine. *Indice completo saltat scriptor pede laeto*. Fin. This is the way the world ends. This is the way the world ends. This is the way the world ends. Not with a bang but a whimper. There are various ways of ending. And ends can have various effects, often a substantial and significant effect on the whole thrust of a passage, poem, play or book. For example, there is the unsettling conclusion to Virgil's *Aeneid*, the arresting *Georgics* 4.523ff. (on Orpheus' severed head), Horace's totally subversive *Epode* 2.67ff., the abrupt and enigmatic close of the first of Pound's *Cantos* ('So that:'), the sombre impact of the final scene in *Hamlet* and the earthier impact of the monologue by Molly Bloom that terminates *Ulysses*. In a recent upsurge of interest in this topic literary critics have produced increasingly perceptive analyses of endings,[1] but the conclusions of the mythical narratives in the *Fasti* have been totally neglected. In remedying that omission this chapter will demonstrate that Ovid obviously regarded this aspect as very important and paid considerable attention to it, most often employing a particular set of techniques to achieve a satisfying sense of closure, but also from time to time keeping readers on their toes and entertaining them by working in terminal tricks and surprises and by blurring, falsifying and undermining closure.[2]

---

[1] Out of a large bibliography I have found most helpful KERMODE, SMITH 1968, RICHTER, HAMAN, TORGOVNICK, BONHEIM 118ff., ROBERTS-DUNN-FOWLER, SPINA, LOWE 58–60, 151–6, FOWLER 2000 239–307 and ABBOTT 51ff., 168ff.

[2] Sometimes it is hard to be sure exactly where the end starts, i.e. how many of the last lines of an account should be classified as the conclusion. In general I have looked for the final distinct phase in a narrative, encompassing the ultimate act(s)/speech(es)/incident(s)/comment(s), and when in doubt I have erred on the side of caution, going for a shorter rather than a longer ending (so as not to claim too much in connection with Ovidian closure).

A Standard Ending

When discussing why the Luperci run naked, Ovid suggests several reasons but devotes most space to a story which ascribes a particular cause for their god's dislike of clothing. He ushers it in at 2.303ff. as follows:

> sed cur praecipue fugiat velamina Faunus,
> traditur antiqui fabula plena ioci.
> forte comes dominae iuvenis Tirynthius ibat: 305
> vidit ab excelso Faunus utrumque iugo;
> vidit et incaluit, 'montana'que 'numina', dixit
> 'nil mihi vobiscum est: hic meus ardor erit.'

> But an old and very funny story is handed down [explaining] why Faunus has a particular aversion to clothing. By chance the Tirynthian youth was walking as a companion to his mistress; Faunus saw them both from a high ridge. He saw, grew hot with passion and said: 'Mountain goddesses, you are nothing to me: this one will be my flame.'

Subsequently in the dark Faunus by mistake tries to rape Hercules, who is wearing Omphale's clothes, and who pushes him off (see pp. 253ff.). Ovid tops off his innovation of making Hercules' cross-dressing laughable in connection with Faunus too (not just the hero himself) with the finale at 351ff.:

> fit sonus, inclamat comites et lumina poscit
> Maeonis: inlatis ignibus acta patent.
> ille gemit lecto graviter deiectus ab alto,
> membraque de dura vix sua tollit humo.
> ridet et Alcides et qui videre iacentem, 355
> ridet amatorem Lyda puella suum.
> veste deus lusus fallentes lumina vestes
> non amat, et nudos ad sua sacra vocat.

> There was a crash. The Maeonian [Omphale] called out to her companions; torches were brought in, and what he had been up to became clear. After falling heavily, hurled from the bed, he groaned and could scarcely raise his body from the hard ground. Hercules and those who saw him lying there laughed; the Lydian young woman laughed at her lover. Made a fool of by clothes, the god does not love clothes, which deceive the eye, and summons people naked to his rites.

There the narrative has reached a natural conclusion. The story has gone about as far as it can go (all that is missing is Faunus' reaction to the mirth, which we hardly need to be told) and just as far as it needs to go (as the *aetion* is now complete). The whole issue of the intended assault is decided and speculation about the extent of Faunus' success is ended.[3] There is a complementary sense of finality in the detail of cessation (of the rape attempt, and of the god's acceptance of clothing).

Ovid also rounds off his account stylistically. There is a double (strongly reinforcing) ring structure. Framing the actual narrative there are two couplets (303f., 357f.) of aetiological comment in which there is reference to the present and Faunus eschewing clothes. Within the narrative itself 353–6 recall 305–8: in both quatrains Faunus' desire for Omphale figures; there is anaphora of verbs at the start of 306f. and 355f.; the words *comes* (305, 351) and *video* (305f., 355) are common; and *ab excelso . . . iugo* in 306 is echoed by *lecto . . . ab alto* in 353. There is also at the end a reversal of the opening, and this makes for a feeling of resolution and repayment: Faunus standing on the high ridge and looking down in 306 is replaced by Faunus thrown off the high bed and lying down on the ground, looked down on himself; the superior speaking god of 307f. is succeeded by the humbled groaning god; and at 307f. he dismisses other females and claims Omphale as his lover, only to be dismissed himself and laughed at as a lover by her. Ovid also includes a flourish to finish off neatly: at 355f. there is extensive assonance and homoeoteleuton (and perhaps onomatopoeia in the repeated long i), anaphora, a tricolon crescendo[4] and pointed word order (*Lyda puella* ironically enfolded by *amatorem . . . suum*); and 357f. is another very musical couplet, with skilful placement of words (*vestis* at either end of 357, the juxtaposition *lusus fallentes*) and the play in *non amat* picking up *amatorem* (356).

The aetiological conclusion is standard for the *Fasti* (with 357f. picking up like a QED the announcement of the *aetion* at 303f.). So is the combination of action (at 351ff.) with comment (at 357f.), and the happy ending (which provides a proper and satisfying end for this generally light-hearted tale). This is also a typically vivid and memorable close, with the aural appeal of the crash as Faunus hits the ground, his subsequent groans and the roars of laughter above and all around him (magnified in the enclosed, echoing cave), and with the chiaroscuro effect, as the torches suddenly highlight this would-be rapist of Hercules, this god who is disabled merely by being pushed out of a bed.[5] As he often does, Ovid ends piquantly with a start (the beginning of the practice of nudity by the gods' followers), enlivens his narrative by a sudden switch away from what immediately preceded (as Faunus is now discovered, and everybody wakes up, and the scene becomes bright, crowded and noisy) and sets the story in its wider perspective by giving its ramifications (the custom of going naked). In the final lines of the narrative the focus is (aptly enough) on Faunus' comic groans and the laughter of the company, and after a brief flurry of activity in 351f. the pace slows, as Ovid dwells on those two items and devotes a full couplet to each (which makes for a settled effect).

---

[3] There is no surviving earlier version of this tale (see BÖMER II 104), so readers would presumably have been kept in suspense until 351ff.

[4] Within the third member of a tricolon diminuendo: the three stages of the rape (see pp. 67ff.) occupy 305–30 (PRELUDE), 331–50 (CONTACT) and 351–6 (AFTERMATH).

There is also some characteristic complexity, for added interest. This is one of a series of five narratives concerned with frustrated and discomfited males that end with laughter (1.393ff., 2.305ff., 361ff., 3.677ff., 737ff.).[6] At 2.349ff. there are obvious similarities to the end of Priapus' unsuccessful attempt to rape Lotis at 1.435ff.: in both cases a divine rapist operating outdoors at night is pushed off, exposed by light (*lumen*) and laughed at (*risus, rideo*) by the company, and the failure is responsible for an aspect of cult practice. But here Ovid actually tops his own earlier ending by making this one more demeaning: this rapist (who has just tried to assault Hercules!) is foiled not by an ass braying but by his own bungling; when he is pushed off, he is left disabled, down and moaning in pain, unlike Priapus; whereas Lotis fled in terror, Faunus' two victims stay and chortle, and he is laughed at by humans rather than divinities (with greater stress on the mockery by means of the repeated *ridet* in 355f., as opposed to the single *risus* in 1.438). The conclusion of the tale of Faunus also has (rather surprising) ties to that of the immediately succeeding narrative (and the physical proximity of the two passages makes the connection particularly clear): at 2.375ff. Romulus is also frustrated and distressed, and there is again laughter in the midst of a group of humans; there are verbal echoes too (*rideo* at the start of the lines in 355f. and 377; *video* in 355 and 376; *nudus* in 358 and 376), and again the narrative is followed by a couplet of aetiological comment connected with the nudity of the Luperci; more subtly Romulus was also a rapist and became a god. In addition, there are some lively twists (for example, Romulus at 2.361ff. was unsuccessful in his attempt to recover booty taken from him, rather than when going after prey himself, and there it is the male protagonist who laughs, and it is in a wry and disappointed fashion this time).[7]

---

[5] The humour may be heightened by verbal play at 353f.: in the hexameter *graviter* ('heavily') might contain mocking allusion to the sense 'with dignity' (*OLD* s.v. 8, *TLL* VI,1.2302.32ff.), while the pentameter could refer to sudden detumescence (for *membrum* of the penis see ADAMS 46, 224 and *TLL* VIII.636.49ff.; for *tollo* of erection cf. e.g. Catull. 67.22; *dura* 'hard' (cf. *durius* 'harder' in 346) could contrast with the present state of Faunus' penis). In addition, 357f. underline the incongruous connection between a failed rape and a fertility ritual (the Lupercalia).

[6] These occur in the first three books only, so that this type of finale does not become predictable and stale through over-use.

Standard Features

The passage just studied has illustrated most of the standard features of narrative closure in the *Fasti*, and it is now time to elaborate on those already noted and to add a few more.

In general Ovid aims at a satisfying and logical conclusion, with tension relaxed, issues resolved and loose ends tied up.[8] The feeling of finality is often strengthened by means of terminal motifs: in addition to cessation (as in the Faunus story) we commonly find death, funeral, departure, disappearance, punishment, reward, return (to a place or original state) and completion (of a task, promise, order etc.).[9] As with Faunus above, so elsewhere Ovid frequently rounds off by means of a stylistic flourish,[10] a reversal of the mood, fortune, situation etc. at the start,[11] and ring structure.[12] For similar effect Ovid also employs the parallel ending (recalling not the start but another prior part of the narrative). So at 5.543f., when Latona adds Orion to the stars for protecting her from the scorpion, the miraculous reward for a service there by a deity (who speaks briefly) recalls the miraculous reward for the hospitality of Orion's father Hyrieus by Jupiter (who speaks briefly) at 523–36 (and in this account the giant's name occurs only at 536 and 543). There is a pleasing pattern (like father, like son) for a neat finish, and we find another and obviously final reward, which provides a natural terminus for Orion's part in the passage, as 523ff. did for Hyrieus' part. Again at 6.761f., when Jupiter revives Asclepius (whom he had killed with his bolt because Pluto and Clotho objected to him bringing Hippolytus back to life) and sets him among the stars as Anguitenens, there is an obvious parallel with 749–56, where Asclepius revived Hippolytus (in both cases someone killed by a god is given a new life, name and location). Here it is the antithesis that reinforces the sense of finality: in contrast to the case of Asclepius, Jupiter condones the restoration, and nobody else is likely to object to what he did or is powerful enough to undo it, so that there is an aura of unalterable completion here.[13]

---

[7] The climaxes of the last two passages in this series are similarly bound to the earlier three (e.g. at 3.693f. a divine lover is thwarted, humiliated and ridiculed, with *rideo* at the start of the hexameter; and at 3.757ff. a divine thief is foiled and mocked by the company, with *rideo* at the beginning of 758 and 759). For more on this Faunus story see FANTHAM 1983 192ff.

[8] There are, of course, some open elements in all endings (cf. e.g. FOWLER 2000 239ff.). For example, at 2.113ff. Arion is rescued and the dolphin is set among the stars, but we are not told what happened to Arion's abductors or what Arion did subsequently.

[9] See e.g. 1.377ff., 2.847ff., 1.273, 2.509, 1.275, 6.707f., 2.375, 1.274, 3.384, 391f., 807f.

[10] E.g. 1.437ff., 2.335f., 448, 583ff., 721ff., 5.182, 414, 617ff., 719f., 6.707f., 761f.

Not surprisingly in view of the nature of the poem, the most popular type of closure involves aetiology. Most often the *aetion* is spelled out at the conclusion after being promised, asked for or otherwise introduced at the start,[14] but sometimes for impact an *aetion* is tacked on unannounced.[15] As for form, in all but one case[16] (which consists entirely of comment by the narrator) Ovid terminates his accounts with action, often (in 23 instances) action on its own, but more often (in 34 instances) combined with speech and/or narrator's comment; there is never any significant amount of description. The vast majority of the ends are happy to a greater or lesser extent, concluding on a note of success, relief or splendid reward (helping to lighten the tone of the *Fasti* as a whole). Only seven are downbeat and sad,[17] and their comparative rarity heightens their sombre force. There are also a few cases where the tone is neutral or uncertain[18] and mixed (with both positive and negative elements).[19] Generally Ovid avoids the dramatic climax and goes instead for something low-key and factual, with the pace slowed down for a diminuendo effect. This again means increased impact for the exceptions—the roars of laughter at 1.437f., 2.355f. and 3.759f.; the triumph at 1.539ff. and 2.237ff.; the chilling efficiency at 2.709f. (where after receiving his father's message Sextus immediately slaughters the leading men of Gabii); and the sensational 3.45ff. (see pp. 279f.) and 4.237ff. (quoted in the next paragraph). Ovid is also quite fond of adding vivacity by means of a snappy conclusion. On eight occasions his ending consists of a single couplet of swift and decisive action,[20] and on another eight occasions within a longer ending there is a brisk final couplet made up of short sentences and clauses.[21] With both types asyndeton, brevity of expression, alliteration, assonance of short vowels and dactylic rhythm often contribute to the lightness and quickness, as at 6.549f., where Ino gives her assent to a prediction of the end of suffering and the assumption of divine status with new names for herself and her son:

---

[11] At 1.379f., 439, 541f., 2.188ff., 237ff., 351ff., 447f., 3.45, 673, 4.671f., 857f., 6.167f., 393f. Such inversion can also give the finale definite punch (e.g. the sense of achievement and triumph at 1.379f., 2.448 and 4.671f.). There are sometimes additional complexities. For example, at 2.448 there is a reversal of 429f. and of 437; and 4.671f. reverses the infertility at 641ff. while also picking up the advice at 670, producing a pattern of infertility, advice given, advice taken, fertility.

[12] See e.g. 1.363ff., 2.266, 421, 851f. For the double ring see 2.113ff. and 6.393f.

[13] There is also much complexity and irony, as 762 highlights: Jupiter himself does what he punished Asclepius for doing; the reviver is himself revived, as the killer becomes a reviver; Phoebus' love for his son making him condone the raising of the dead is matched by Jupiter's love for his son (Phoebus himself) making him actually raise the dead. In other parallel endings 2.191f. echo 177ff. with an additional and concluding blow to finish off the persecution of Callisto; and at 4.240f. Attis' wish for an end to loving at 228 prior to his sin is picked up with a similar wish after his sin as he is in the process of mutilating himself, and that forceful repetition of the wish is part of the irrevocable realization of it.

[14] At 1.259ff., 393ff., 2.247ff., 305ff., 361ff., 381ff., 3.179ff., 545ff., 677ff., 4.197ff., 223ff., 809ff., 879ff., 5.194ff., 451ff., 605ff., 639ff., 697ff., 6.351ff., 485ff.

[15] At 2.155ff., 459ff., 3.461ff., 853ff., 5.115ff., 169ff., 381ff.

[16] 2.237ff.

> adnuerat, promissa fides; posuere labores,
> nomina mutarunt: hic deus, illa dea est. 550

> She nodded assent, a promise was made; their labours ended, they changed their names; he's a god, she's a goddess.

Further considerations also help ensure that Ovid's closes are not dull. We have already noted in the last section one stimulating termination with a start, and elsewhere we find birth and new names, status, appearance and so on.[22] So too other forms of the lively switch away from the immediately preceding lines include a change to a different mood, time, scene, character or thing, and the abrupt introduction of address, question and exclamation,[23] and Ovid thereby often opens up the perspective by giving us a glimpse of the story's consequences.[24] There are also many other instances of the graphic and striking finale—like Priapus massively erect in the moonlight (and, one presumes, casting a long shadow) at 1.437f., and Arion nonchalantly seated on the dolphin, paying it a fare by playing for it, and simultaneously charming the sea to ensure a smooth passage for himself and his rescuer (2.115f.).[25] There are further examples of significant focus too, and they involve impact, point and humour as well as aptness. At 4.237ff. Erato concentrates on the castration of Attis:

---

[17] 2.155ff., 687ff., 3.11ff., 4.223ff., 5.381ff., 451ff., 6.613ff.

[18] 2.247ff., 3.853ff., 4.197ff., 5.11ff., 81ff., 115ff., 639ff., 699ff., 6.105ff., 657ff., 697ff.

[19] 2.361ff., 613ff., 847ff., 5.169ff.

[20] 1.379f., 2.265f., 471f., 709f., 3.807f., 4.671f., 6.167f., 549f.

[21] 2.471f., 851f., 4.241f., 347f., 5.617f., 6.343f., 707f., 761f.

> ille etiam saxo corpus laniavit acuto,
>   longaque in immundo pulvere tracta coma est,
> voxque fuit, 'merui: meritas do sanguine poenas.
>   ah pereant partes quae nocuere mihi!' 240
> 'ah pereant' dicebat adhuc; onus inguinis aufert,
>   nullaque sunt subito signa relicta viri.

> He even mutilated his body with a sharp rock and dragged his long hair in the filthy dust, saying, 'I have deserved it. With my blood I am paying the penalty I have deserved. Ah, let me destroy the private parts that have ruined me!' While still saying, 'Ah, let me destroy!' he removed his groin's burden, and suddenly no sign of his manhood remained.

Erato there devotes the climax of her narrative and 6 out of 20 lines to the mutilation, dwelling on it with a chilling satisfaction and absence of sympathy, and relishing the punishment of this boy who broke his oath to remain true to Cybele (her grandmother).[26] As well as the bleakness there is also the darkly witty touch of putting into the mouth of Erato with her erotic connection[27] these lines on the curtailment of loving for Attis and the revenge for his intercourse with a nymph that offended against Cybele's chaste love for him. At 1.543ff.

---

[22] See e.g. 1.379f., 2.117f., 189f., 421f.

[23] As at 1.275f., 439f., 540, 583f., 2.113ff., 4.857.

[24] Especially the effect on cult (such as the setting up of altars and temples) and ensuing alteration of nomenclature and condition (change to a star, a mother, a goddess etc.). See e.g. 1.276, 439f., 2.117f., 421, 511f.

[25] Cf. also 2.611ff., 3.45ff., 221ff., 691ff., 757ff., 4.237ff., 6.391f. and 708.

[26] See further p. 42.

[27] Cf. 4.196.

Ovid, inspired by Carmentis, told of Hercules' defeat of Cacus, but in the last two lines (583f.) the focus unexpectedly shifts to Carmentis:

> nec tacet Evandri mater prope tempus adesse
>   Hercule quo tellus sit satis usa suo.
>
> Evander's mother did not keep silent about the imminent arrival of the moment when the earth had sufficiently availed itself of its Hercules.

Fittingly and amusingly this inspirer[28] here wrenches the focus back on to herself and represents herself as superior even to the great Hercules (in view of her divine prophetic knowledge). There is also a great joke in *nec tacet* ('did not keep silent') applied to the garrulous Carmentis (who came out with two long and self-indulgent speeches at 1.479ff. and 509ff. which are totally unconnected with her function as interpreter of the cause of the Carmentalia). So too she prophesies the end of Hercules' time on earth as the end of the lines she has prompted is reached; she stresses her reliability and perceptiveness at the very point when she concludes the accounts she has inspired (1.469ff. and 543ff.) without actually bothering to tell of the origins of her rites as she was asked to do in 465; and she works herself in irrelevantly at the close of her whole irrelevant narrative.[29]

Finally, it is not only laughter that links endings: stellification acts as a more extensive and elaborate form of terminal connection.[30] In the *Fasti* there is a constellation of fourteen narratives explaining the origins of stars, and although there are differences between the climaxes (e.g. in the expression of the actual process of becoming a star), there are also intricate ties. In fact, I suspect that Ovid may have arranged these stellar narratives to form groups and utilized closure to reinforce the grouping. Admittedly this is ordering over a long range, but once the reader becomes alert to the possibility patterns can be discerned (consistently involving triads). The first three of these endings concern the Dolphin (2.117f.); Callisto and her son (2.188ff.); and the Snake, the Bird and the Bowl (2.265f.). There is an obvious tricolon crescendo there (in the number of stars each time), and a tricolon diminuendo interlocks with it, as the next two ends involve a pair of fish (2.471f.) and the Crown (3.513ff.). That whole cluster is framed by references to *stellas . . . novem* ('nine stars') at 2.118 and 3.516, and within it *mico* 'glitter', *sidera* 'stars' and *habeo* 'have' are repeated to draw the myths together.[31] Next comes a trio of animal helpers—the Kite (3.807f.), the Ram (3.875f.) and the Goat (5.127f.). We are informed at the closes that the first and the third were translated to heaven as a reward for their service to Jupiter, while *venit* (3.808) is echoed by *pervenit* (3.876), as *fit sidus* (3.875) is by *sidera . . . / fecit* (5.127f.). The next three stories are all connected with the death of a male and concern the stellification of semidivine figures—the Hyades (5.181f.), Chiron (5.413f.), and Orion (5.543f.). In each conclusion there is allusion to the name of these figures and an admirable quality that they possessed, while the Hyades and Orion become stars specifically because of their *pietas* 'devotion'. Finally there is a triad of males connected with Jupiter—the single Bull (5.617f.), the twins Castor and Pollux (5.715ff.) and the single Asclepius (6.761f.). In each climax there is reference to Jupiter the star-maker, and there is a single address at 5.617f., two apostrophes at 5.715ff., and a single address at 6.761f. (not to mention repetition of *caelum* in 5.617, 715 and 717). Even if one balks at the idea of formal patterning of these narratives, the extensive links between their final lines are clear.

---

[28] On whom see pp. 34ff.

[29] There is focus with similar effects at 2.355f., 3.45ff., 225ff., 758f., 5.179ff., 209ff. and 6.707f.

[30] It also makes for a strong sense of closure: there is the stability of a star fixed irrevocably in the sky, and also the more this particular type of conclusion is used the more familiar it becomes, with the result that when stellification figures the reader feels that the end has come, just as before. On these star myths cf. also FRÉCAUT 294ff.

A Deviant Ending

The artful opening of the third book of the *Fasti* consists of an address to Mars:

> Bellice, depositis clipeo paulisper et hasta,
>   Mars, ades et nitidas casside solve comas.
> forsitan ipse roges quid sit cum Marte poetae:
>   a te qui canitur nomina mensis habet.
> ipse vides manibus peragi fera bella Minervae: 5
>   num minus ingenuis artibus illa vacat?
> Palladis exemplo ponendae tempora sume
>   cuspidis: invenies et quod inermis agas.
> tum quoque inermis eras, cum te Romana sacerdos
>   cepit, ut huic urbi semina magna dares. 10

---

[31] *Mico* at 2.188, 266 and 3.516; *sidera* at 2.266 and 472; *habeo* at 2.118 and 472.

> Warlike Mars, put down your shield and spear for a moment and be with me; remove the helmet from your lustrous hair. Perhaps you are yourself asking what a poet has to do with Mars: the month that is my subject takes its name from you. You see yourself that Minerva wages savage war with her own hands: does that mean that she has any less time for the liberal arts? Follow Pallas' example and take the opportunity to put aside your lance. You'll also find something to do unarmed. You were unarmed then too, when the Roman priestess captivated you, with the result that you gave mighty semen for this city.

Apparently picking up directly from 9f., Ovid next recounts the rape of Rhea Silvia by the god (at 11–48). He begins as follows:

> Silvia Vestalis (quid enim vetat inde moveri?)
>   sacra lavaturas mane petebat aquas.
> ventum erat ad molli declivem tramite ripam;
>   ponitur e summa fictilis urna coma:
> fessa resedit humo, ventosque accepit aperto 15
>   pectore, turbatas restituitque comas.
> dum sedet, umbrosae salices volucresque canorae
>   fecerunt somnos et leve murmur aquae;
> blanda quies furtim victis obrepsit ocellis,
>   et cadit a mento languida facta manus. 20

> Silvia the Vestal Virgin (for what prevents me from starting with her?) went one morning to get water to wash the sacred objects. She arrived at a shelving riverbank with a path running gently down it, and she set down the earthenware pitcher that was on her head. Tired, she sat on the ground, bared her breasts, to let the breezes blow on them, and tidied up her ruffled hair. While she was seated there, the shady willows, melodious birds and softly purling water made her drowsy. Sweet sleep stealing up stealthily overpowered her eyes, and her hand went limp and slipped from her chin.

Ovid next tells how Mars raped the priestess as she slept and when she awoke (already pregnant) she recounted a dream that she had just had, in which from her fallen fillet two palm trees grew (one much taller than the other) and her uncle attacked them with an axe, but they were saved by a woodpecker and a she-wolf. The months pass and she gives birth to the twins, at 45ff.:

> Silvia fit mater; Vestae simulacra feruntur 45
>   virgineas oculis opposuisse manus.
> ara deae certe tremuit pariente ministra,
>   et subiit cineres territa flamma suos.

> Silvia became a mother. Vesta's statue is said to have covered its eyes with its virgin hands; certainly the goddess' altar trembled, as her priestess gave birth, and the terrified flame sank beneath its own ashes.

Various by now standard techniques of closure are in operation there. The logical conclusion of the rape has been reached with the birth; there is finality in the end of Silvia's pregnancy (and also a start—to the life of the twins and to the Vestal Virgin as a mother); and there is a distinct feeling of climax in the extreme response of Vesta's sacred objects. To round off, there is ring composition,[32] reversal of the opening[33] and quite a stylish finish.[34] With the horror of Vesta's reaction there is also a sudden veering away from the preceding lines (in terms of mood, attitude and point of view) and a focus on the aptly momentous activities of the goddess' outraged statue, altar and flame. This is also a typically vivid and arresting finale. The scandal of a Vestal giving birth is highlighted by the curt *Silvia fit mater* (with *Silvia* and *mater* stressed by position), which picks up and corrects *Silvia Vestalis* in 11. The miraculous and ominous response of Vesta's image, altar and fire is unique and gives the tale a new dark tinge,[35] and there is emphasis in the threefold repetition. The sequence of parturition and dismay figures in both couplets by way of reinforcement. And the fact that these lines are dynamic and sensational (in contrast to the more normal terminal toning down) adds to their impact.

Clearly 11–48 do form an independent and free-standing narrative. But directly afterwards at 49ff. Ovid continues the story, with king Amulius ordering the twins to be drowned in the Tiber, the water shrinking from the crime to leave them high and dry, the wolf and the woodpecker feeding them etc. Initially we are surprised and perplexed as to why Ovid is proceeding beyond the natural and obvious conclusion that has already been reached at 45–8. Some readers may eventually guess that he is moving on to the might of Mars' progeny (alluded to in line 10). The real point is not clarified until the very end (75–8), where Romulus (after re-establishing his grandfather and founding Rome) calls a month March after Mars. Only now is it revealed that all along Ovid was actually expanding not on 9f. but on line 4[36] (where he remarks that the month that is his present subject got its name from Mars), as is underlined by the ring structure (*nomen* 'name', *mensis* 'month' and allusion to Mars in 76f. and 4). So in fact Ovid is including his standard discussion of the derivation of the month's name,[37] but disguises that fact by using lines 5–10 as a diversion (distracting us from 4) and by going all around the houses in his aetiological account (he begins as far back as the conception of Romulus, i.e. the origin of the man responsible for the origin of the month's name; and subsequently, at 49ff., he adds many perfectly well known details from the twins' early years, going on and on, and mystifying the reader).[38]

---

[32] References to Silvia (in the same point in the lines), Vesta and her sacred things at 11f. and 45ff.; allusion to virginity (11, 46) and eyes (19, 46); also *pono/oppono* (14, 46) and *manus* in the same metrical *sedes* (20, 46).

[33] The loss of virginity, the outraging of the sacred objects, the inversion of tranquility.

[34] Especially the tricolon diminuendo in *Vestae . . . suos*; the assonance in 47 and 48; the placement of words in 45 (*mater* and *Vestae* juxtaposed), 46 (the framing, with *virgineas . . . manus* suggestively enfolding *oculis*) and 47 (*ara* and *ministra* in tension at either end of the line, and the juxtapostion of their actions in *tremuit pariente*).

[35] BÖMER II 144f. cites no parallels for such behaviour by Vesta's holy things, nor do the other commentators.

So 45–8 are part of an elaborate ruse and constitute a complicated kind of ending. There is genuine closure there (within the narrative at 11–48). But, as 11–48 ultimately amount to just an episode in a longer account and are used as mere preamble for 49ff., there is a kind of false closure too. In fact, the conclusion at 45ff. is part of an introduction, and it occurs in the middle of Ovid's whole *aetion* (11–78). There is also deliberate blurring of the end. Even though the first narrative is complete at 45–8, we are, of course, well aware that there is much more to the whole Romulus and Remus story and in particular that there is the immediate sequel of Amulius' response to their birth, and Ovid in fact reminded us of that with Rhea Silvia's prophetic dream at 31ff. This means that he can quite logically continue in line 49, and 31ff. covertly prepare for that continuation (specifically for the king's attack on the boys and the help of the wolf and woodpecker). The transition is also smoothed by several links at 49ff.: *hoc* 'this' (of the birth) in 49 and reference to the twins at 51–3 pick up directly from 45ff.; Amulius' disapproval of the birth parallels that of Vesta; his crime (*scelus*, 51) of trying to kill the infants mirrors the offence of the Vestal Virgin in producing them; and the miraculous response of the inanimate water of the Tiber (shrinking away) recalls the marvellous reaction of Vesta's sacred things (especially the flame sinking beneath its ashes). One final instance of Ovidian toying with the reader is worth noting. At 45–8 Ovid continues beyond the actual act of procreation to its effect on Vesta and spends a full three and a half lines on that effect. This does make for a striking climax, as has been seen; but some readers will be left wondering if there is any particular point to this novel stress on Vesta's revulsion and how exactly all of this is relevant to Mars' rape of Rhea Silvia. Such a puzzle subtly prefigures the puzzle of why Ovid goes on with the story at 49ff. With similar subtlety the continuation and expansiveness at 45–8 foreshadow the continuation and expansiveness at 49ff.[39]

---

[36] FRAZER III 4 sees that Ovid is taking up line 4 but fails to spot the trick.

[37] Cf. FANTHAM 1998 30f.

[38] To ensure readers do not become too irritated or even bored by all this padding there are various touches of humour, such as the witty juxtaposition of *pauper* 'poor' and *opes* ('help', but with play on the sense of 'wealth') in 56, the joke in 63f. of the twins robbing robbers and stealing for themselves cattle stolen by them from others, and the flippancy at 69f.

Deviations

The blurred ending due to a run-on like that just noted occurs elsewhere too (thanks to the continuations at 1.543ff., 2.711ff., 5.215ff. and 6.131ff.), and such non-closure seems not out of place in a work that is itself incomplete.[40] But our effervescent poet also employs various other non-standard techniques of conclusion, which merit consideration in this concluding section.

Sometimes Ovid provides a deliberately unsatisfying close, rousing expectations only to frustrate them. So at 3.795ff. and 4.879ff. he would have us believe that he will recount in some detail a theomachy and the duel between Aeneas and Mezentius, but in the end he aborts the former and covers the latter very briefly;[41] so too he ends narratives prematurely without giving the promised *aetion* at 1.584 and 6.708.[42] At other times Ovid does give us a satisfying close, but subsequently undermines it. At 2.305ff. he presents Faunus' attempted rape of Omphale to explain the nudity of the Luperci, and effectively rounds off that account at 351ff. (as we have seen); but then he immediately goes on to provide another (Roman) *aetion* at 359ff. He plays the same trick on readers with his explication of Taurus as Europa's bull, or alternatively Io, at 5.605–620. More elaborately, at 3.179ff. and 545ff. he presents narratives to clarify why matrons worship Mars and who Anna Perenna is, but after each account he proceeds to add several extra explanations and openly attributes the greatest authority to one of those later explanations in particular (at 3.250 and 662).

---

[39] There are even links between 45–8 and the end of the succeeding narrative: at 45ff. the victim Silvia is paired with the chaste Vesta (who disapproves of Silvia's offence), and at 73ff. her son Romulus is paired with the rapist Mars (who approves of Romulus' dutifulness).

[40] Cf. BARCHIESI 1997 259ff., NEWLANDS 209ff. and Miller in BOYD 2002 167 on the (perhaps intentionally) incomplete state of the *Fasti*.

[41] See pp. 103ff.

[42] See pp. 228f. and 61f.

There are also examples of false closure, whereby Ovid tries to make us think that the end has been reached before it really has and thus gets different kinds of impact for the material that ensues. At 2.235f. it looks as if Ovid's account of the death of the Fabii is complete (especially because *Fabii*, *dies* and the destruction of the whole clan appear there as they had at the start in 195f.); but then Ovid adds a triumphant coda on the single boy of the family who survived, and from whom Quintus Fabius Maximus Cunctator descended. At 2.610 many would deduce that Ovid's narrative elucidating the identity of the goddess Muta with her magic and ghostly associations is over when the nymph Lara has her tongue ripped out and is consigned to the Underworld; but the further cruel blow of Mercury's callous rape of her is appended. A more involved instance occurs at 3.737ff., where Ovid is telling how Bacchus discovered honey and promises a pleasantly amusing tale (738). By 743f. the god has already made his discovery (when bees come, attracted by his companions' cymbals, and he shuts them up in a hollow tree), and there is ring structure with a terminal flavour (744 recalls 736), which leaves one feeling that the tale was short and unsatisfying and wondering where on earth the humour was. But there is more to come—a further sixteen lines (two thirds of the whole narrative) on the sequel to Bacchus' invention:

> ut satyri levisque senex tetigere saporem 745
> quaerebant flavos per nemus omne favos.
> audit in exesa stridorem examinis ulmo,
> aspicit et ceras dissimulatque senex;
> utque piger pandi tergo residebat aselli,
> adplicat hunc ulmo corticibusque cavis. 750
> constitit ipse super ramoso stipite nixus,
> atque avide trunco condita mella petit:
> milia crabronum coeunt, et vertice nudo
> spicula defigunt oraque sima notant.
> ille cadit praeceps et calce feritur aselli, 755
> inclamatque suos auxiliumque rogat.

> concurrunt satyri turgentiaque ora parentis
> ridunt: percusso claudicat ille genu.
> ridet et ipse deus, limumque inducere monstrat;
> hic paret monitis et linit ora luto. 760
>
> When the Satyrs and the old man with the smooth bald head tasted the flavour, they searched for yellow honeycombs throughout the whole grove. The old man heard the buzz of a swarm in a rotted elm, spotted wax and pretended he hadn't. As he was sitting lazily on the back of a sagging ass, he rode right up to the elm and its enclosing bark. He stood on the ass and, leaning on the branching trunk, greedily reached for the honey stored inside it. Thousands of hornets came in a mass, buried their stings in his bald head and put their marks on his snub-nosed face. He fell headlong and the ass kicked him with the back of its hoof; he called out to his sons, begging for help. The Satyrs came running up and at their father's swollen face burst out laughing; he limped from the kick to his knee. The god himself also laughed and showed him how to smear on mud. Silenus took his advice and coated his face with muck.

Initially these lines seem still serious enough, so that the tantalizing continues. But then a gradual build up in levity begins (sneaky Silenus in 748; lazy Silenus in 749f., so fat that he makes the ass' back sag), leading into the broad farce at 753ff., with the rapid succession of humiliations and the final picture of Silenus with muck all over his swollen face. The basic humour in Silenus being misled in thinking that the tree was full of bees (not hornets)[43] is increased by inducing readers to labour under the same misapprehension, so that we are similarly surprised by the hornets: we are made to think of bees by *examinis* 'swarm' and *ceras* 'wax' in 747f., by the fact that bees do nest in rotted trees[44] (as 743 has carefully reminded us) and by *corticibusque cavis* in 750, which calls to mind Virgilian phraseology applied to bees (*corticibusque cavis* and *corticibus . . . cavatis* at *G.* 2.453 and 4.33). So this addendum contains extensive humour which stands out all the more for being held back and which has a marked influence on the appeal of the passage as a whole.[45]

The unpredictable Ovid also employs several kinds of surprise ending, especially in an aetiological context. Sometimes a promised *aetion* is so long deferred that when it finally comes in the conclusion it has almost been forgotten and so is rather unexpected, as when Ovid announces at 2.685 that he will elucidate the Regifugium, but only gets around to the actual expulsion of Tarquin at 851f.[46] At other times the *aetion* is actually denied: for example, at 1.465ff. Ovid asks Carmentis to explain the origins and nature of the rites of the Carmentalia, but by the end of the two subsequent narratives inspired by her that question has still not been addressed (although instead she does clarify the genesis of the Ara Maxima at 1.581f.).[47] Rather similar is 2.511f., where we do get aetiological comment (about Quirinus' temples and rites and the name of the Quirinal Hill) but it is not the comment that we were led to expect (a full five lines on derivations of 'Quirinus' at 476ff. followed by a story introduced with *nam* 'for' in 481 suggested that Ovid would be clarifying the source of the name).[48] On other occasions we are given the *aetion* for which we have been waiting but also an extra one[49] or two.[50] Ovid is also capable of holding back important information until the very end. We saw in the previous section how 3.75ff. at last reveal that Ovid was in fact providing a derivation of March from Mars. Then there is 3.461ff., where Ariadne, distressed by reports of Bacchus' love for a female Indian captive, goes off on her own along the beach and complains to herself at great length about Bacchus' perfidy, wishing that he would be true to her, asking him why he saved her when she was abandoned by Theseus, remarking that it is not surprising that one born in fire should inflame her, and protesting that he used to promise her heaven. But then at 507ff. comes the sudden revelation that Bacchus had actually been there all along, walking behind her and listening to her whine on and on about him and address him. Further deflating her complaints, he does now actually give her a place in heaven; and, picking up her allusion to his fiery origins, he changes her crown into nine fires (i.e. stars).

---

[43] For hornets besieging bees see MYNORS 290.

[44] Cf. e.g. Virgil *G.* 4.44. Virgil's *exesaeque arboris antro* there may be deliberately echoed by Ovid in 747 with his *exesa . . . ulmo*, to increase the apian ambience.

[45] There are also minor surprises at 5.105f. and 259f., where we reach the *aetion* and apparently the climax, only to find an extra couplet tacked on.

Ovid also achieves surprise when he follows closely the main outlines of a particular model for most of his narrative but then suddenly deviates at the end. He does this with Virgil at 1.376ff.[51] Elsewhere there is terminal departure from Livy as a source. At 2.219ff. Ovid in his portrayal of the slaughter of the Fabii does not include the full description of the final battle found in the historian and concludes on much more of an upbeat; and at 6.611ff. in his tale of Tullia he closes with the novel addition of her visit to the temple.[52] At 2.837ff., after a version of the rape of Lucretia that has much in common with Livy 1.56ff.,[53] Ovid's closing depiction of events after Lucretia stabs herself contains major divergences from Livy:

---

[46] Cf. also 3.259ff., 3.545ff. and 5.493ff. for such deferment.

[47] Cf. also 6.657ff. (where one *aetion* out of the three requested is not supplied) and 6.697ff. (where Ovid's question to Minerva about the derivation of Quinquatrus is totally ignored): see pp. 59ff.

[48] In fact none of the derivations offered at 477–80 receives corroboration in the account at 481ff., and the explanation in 479 is actually invalidated at 507.

[49] At 1.379f., 2.609ff., 5.103ff., 255ff., 617f., 6.345ff. and 543ff.

[50] At 2.187ff.

[51] See further pp. 227f. In addition, Ovid there claims that Aristaeus was the

> Brutus adest, tandemque animo sua nomina fallit,
> fixaque semanimi corpore tela rapit,
> stillantemque tenens generoso sanguine cultrum
> edidit impavidos ore minante sonos: 840
> 'per tibi ego hunc iuro fortem castumque cruorem,
> perque tuos manes, qui mihi numen erunt,
> Tarquinium profuga poenas cum stirpe daturum.
> iam satis est virtus dissimulata diu.'
> illa iacens ad verba oculos sine lumine movit, 845
> visaque concussa dicta probare coma.
> fertur in exsequias animi matrona virilis
> et secum lacrimas invidiamque trahit.
> volnus inane patet: Brutus clamore Quirites
> concitat et regis facta nefanda refert. 850
> Tarquinius cum prole fugit: capit annua consul
> iura: dies regnis illa suprema fuit.

> Brutus was there, finally belying his name by showing intelligence. He seized the weapon stuck in her half-dead body and, holding the knife that dripped with her noble blood, he spoke these fearless words in a menacing voice: 'By this brave and chaste blood, by your ghost, which will be a god to me, I swear to you that Tarquin and his family will be banished and punished. My courage has been concealed for long enough now.' At these words she moved her lightless eyes as she lay there, and a stirring of her hair made it seem that she approved of his speech. That matron of manly spirit was borne to her funeral, attracting tears and indignation to attend her. Her gaping wound was exposed. Brutus roused the Romans, shouting out and recounting the king's unspeakable crimes. Tarquin and his sons were banished; the consuls entered their year-long term of authority; that was the monarchy's final day.

---

first to sacrifice a bullock as well as being the inventor of bugonia, thereby making an extra twist to Virgil and topping his single *aetion* with two.

[52] See further pp. 185f. and 204f.

[53] See p. 191 n. 41.

There are two substantial differences from Livy here which make for a startling change to the emphasis of the story. Firstly, Ovid's Lucretia is more prominent and more pathetic. In Livy, after she plunges the knife into herself in 1.58, she dies and largely drops out of his two remaining chapters, apart from a few oblique allusions to her.[54] In Ovid she retains her role as protagonist after the stabbing. The focus is kept on her by the fact that she is still half-alive (poignantly so, as she wants to escape her shame in death), by Brutus addressing his speech to her, and by her seeming approval of his words at 845f. (where she is too weak even to nod her head); and she figures as late at 849 (only three and a half lines from the end), where our final picture of her is grimly graphic (she is reduced to a gaping wound). Praise of her not found in Livy (her noble and brave blood, her manly spirit) accentuates her further and brings out the tragedy. Secondly, there is the whole process of the expulsion of Tarquin and his family. Livy with his interest in constitutional issues covers that in detail and devotes the two last chapters of his account to it. Ovid, once he has finished with his heroine, wraps up his version with surprising swiftness,[55] severely abbreviating the aftermath to a mere three and a half lines. So *Fasti* 2.837ff. alter the entire thrust of the end and also of the narrative as a whole: whereas the historian presents Lucretia as just a factor in the momentous business of political change and highlights that, the poet presents the constitutional consequences as just a factor in the story of Lucretia and highlights her.[56]

The end.

---

[54] The knife is drawn from her wound (1.59.1), her body is carried out to the forum (1.59.3), and Brutus briefly mentions her death and suicide at 1.59.8.

[55] Especially surprising as Ovid's lines are in fact supposed to be illuminating the Flight of the King (2.685).

[56] Cf. pp. 193f. Note also that the Lucretia narrative concludes Livy's book (I) but not Ovid's (2.853–64 ensue), so that Ovid manages to work in a second ending at 863f.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

I list below only those works which are referred to in the text or which I have found particularly helpful in the writing of this book.

ABBOTT, H.P. (2002), *The Cambridge Introduction to Narrative* (Cambridge).
ADAMS, J.N. (1982), *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary* (London).
AÉLION, R. (1984), 'Les Mythes de Bellérophon et de Persée', *Lalies* 4: 195–214.
ALBRECHT, M. von (1987), 'Ovidio' in F. Della Corte (ed.) *Enciclopedia Virgiliana III* 907–9 (Rome).
—— (1990), 'Virgilio e le Metamorfosi ovidiane' in M. Gigante (ed.) *Virgilio e gli Augustei* 203–19 (Naples).
ALTON, E.H., WORMELL, D.E.W., and COURTNEY, E. (1988), *P. Ovidi Nasonis Fastorum Libri Sex* (Leipzig).
ANDERSON, W.S. (1997), *Ovid's Metamorphoses Books 1–5* (Norman).
ANDERSSON, T.M. (1976), *Early Epic Scenery. Homer, Virgil and the Medieval Legacy* (Ithaca, New York).
AUSTIN, R.G. (1964), *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Secundus* (Oxford).
—— (1971), *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Primus* (Oxford).
BAL, M. (1985), *Narratology* trans. C. van Boheemen (Toronto).
BALDO, G. (1996), 'Le Metamorfosi ovvero l'impossibile parodia', *AION (filol.)* 18: 7–43.
BARCHIESI, A. (1997), *The Poet and the Prince* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London).
—— (2001), *Speaking Volumes* (London).
BARNES, W.R. (1995), 'Virgil: The Literary Impact' in N. Horsfall (ed.) *Companion to the Study of Virgil* 257–92 (Leiden).
BARSBY, J. and BOOTH, J. (1991), *Ovid Greece and Rome New Surveys in the Classics No. 12* (Oxford).
BERNBECK, E.J. (1967), *Beobachtungen zur Darstellungsart in Ovids Metamorphosen* (Munich).
BEWS, J.P. (1984), 'The metamorphosis of Virgil in the Tristia of Ovid', *BICS* 31: 51–60.
BÖMER, F. (1957, 1958), *P. Ovidius Naso: Die Fasten* (Heidelberg).
BONHEIM, H. (1982), *The Narrative Modes: Techniques of the Short Story* (Cambridge).
BOOTH, J. (1981), 'Aspects of Ovid's Language', *ANRW* II.31.4: 2686–2700.
BOYD, B.W. (2000), '*Celabitur auctor*: The Crisis of Authority and Narrative Patterning in Ovid *Fasti* 5', *Phoenix* 54: 64–98.
—— ed. (2002), *Brill's Companion to Ovid* (Leiden).
BOYLE, A.J. and WOODARD, R.D. (2000), *Ovid Fasti* (Harmondsworth).
BRAUN, L. (1981), 'Kompositionskunst in Ovids Fasti', *ANRW* II.31.4: 2344–83.
BREMOND, C. (1980), 'The Logic of Narrative Possibilities', *New Literary History* 11: 398–411.
BROOKES, I. (1994), 'The Death of Chiron: Ovid, Fasti 5.379–414', *CQ* 44: 444–450.
BRUGNOLI, G. & STOK, F. (1992), *Ovidius* παρῳδήϲαϲ (Pisa).
CAIRNS, F. (1973), 'Catullus' Basia Poems (5, 7, 48)', *Mnemosyne* 26: 15–22.
CASALI, S. (1995), *P. Ovidii Nasonis Heroidum Epistula IX* (Florence).
CHATMAN, S. (1978), *Story and Discourse* (Ithaca & London).
CLAUSS, J.J. & JOHNSTON, S.I., eds. (1997), *Medea* (Princeton).

CLAY, D. (1992), 'Plato's First Words', *YClS* 29: 113–129.

COHAN, S. and SHIRES, L.M. (1988), *Telling Stories* (New York).

CONNORS, C. (1994), 'Ennius, Ovid and representations of Ilia', *MD* 32: 99–112.

CONTE, G.B. (1986), *The Rhetoric of Imitation* (Ithaca, NY).

CURRAN, L.C. (1978), 'Rape and Rape Victims in the Metamorphoses', *Arethusa* 11: 213–241.

DE LUCE, J. (1993), 'O for a Thousand Tongues to Sing: A Footnote on Metamorphosis, Silence and Power', in M. DeForest (ed.) *Woman's Power, Man's Game* 305–21 (Wauconda).

DEACEY, S. & PIERCE, K.F., eds. (1997), *Rape in Antiquity* (London).

DÖPP, S. (1969), *Virgilischer Einfluss im Werk Ovids* (Munich).

DUNDES, A. (1964), *The Morphology of North American Indian Folktales* (Helsinki).

—— (1965), *The Study of Folklore* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ).

EDMUNDS, L. (2001), *Intertextuality and the Reading of Roman Poetry* (Baltimore and London).

ENSIGN, G. (1993), *Great Beginnings Opening Lines of Great Novels* (New York).

FANTHAM, E. (1983), 'Sexual comedy in Ovid's Fasti: sources and motivations', *HSPh* 87: 185–216.

—— (1992a), 'The role of Evander in Ovid's *Fasti*', *Arethusa* 25: 155–71.

—— (1992b), 'Ceres, Liber and Flora: Georgic and anti-Georgic elements in Ovid's Fasti', *PCPhS* 38: 39–56.

—— (1995), 'Rewriting and Rereading the Fasti: Augustus, Ovid and Recent Classical Scholarship', *Antichthon* 29: 42–59.

—— (1995), 'Recent Readings of Ovid's Fasti', *CPh* 90: 367–78.

—— (1998), *Ovid Fasti Book IV* (Cambridge).

FARRELL, J. (1991), *Virgil's Georgics and The Traditions of Ancient Epic* (Oxford and New York).

FEENEY, D.C. (1992), '*Si licet et fas est*: Ovid's Fasti and the Problem of Free Speech under the Principate', in A. Powell (ed.) *Roman Poetry and Propaganda in the Age of Augustus* 1–25 (Bristol).

FORSTER, E.M. (1970), *Aspects of the Novel* (Harmondsworth).

FORSYTHE, G. (1999), *Livy and Early Rome* (Stuttgart).

FOX, M. (1996), *Roman Historical Myths* (Oxford).

FOWLER, D.P. (1997), 'Intertextuality and Classical Studies', *MD* 39: 13–34.

—— (2000), *Roman Constructions Readings in Postmodern Latin* (Oxford).

FRÄNKEL, H. (1945), *Ovid. A Poet Between Two Worlds* (Berkeley).

FRAZER, J.G. (1929), *Publii Ovidii Nasonis Fastorum Libri Sex* (London).

FRÉCAUT, J.-M. (1972), *L'Esprit et L'Humour chez Ovide* (Grenoble).

GALE, M.R. (2000), *Virgil on the Nature of Things* (Cambridge).

GALEF, D. (1993), *The Supporting Cast* (Pennsylvania).

GALINSKY, K. (1996), *Augustan Culture* (Princeton).

GANZENMÜLLER, C. (1911), 'Aus Ovids Werkstatt II', *Philologus* 70: 397–437.

GARNER, R. (1990), *From Homer to Tragedy* (London and New York).

GEE, E. (2000), *Ovid, Aratus and Augustus* (Cambridge).

GENETTE, G. (1972), *Figures III* (Paris).

—— (1988), *Narrative Discourse Revisited* (Ithaca, New York).

GIANNETTI, L.D. (1976), *Understanding Movies* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ).

GINSBERG, W. (1983), *The Cast of Character: The Representation of Personality in Ancient and Medieval Literature* (Toronto).

GODWIN, J. (1995), *Catullus Poems 61–68* (Warminster).

GOLD, B.K. (1992), 'Openings in Horace's Satires and Odes: poet, patron, and audience', *YClS* 29: 161–85.

GREIMAS, A.-J. (1983), *Structural Semantics An Attempt at a Method*, trans. D. McDowell, R. Schleifer and A. Velie (Lincoln and London).

—— (1987), *On Meaning Selected Writings in Semiotic Theory* trans. P.J. Perron and F.H. Collins (Minneapolis).
HAMON, P. (1975), 'Clausules', *Poétique* 6: 495–526.
HARDIE, P. (1990), 'Ovid's Theban History: the first "anti-Aeneid"?', *CQ* 40: 224–35.
—— ed. (2002), *The Cambridge Companion to Ovid* (Cambridge).
HARRIES, B. (1989), 'Causation and the authority of the poet in Ovid's *Fasti*', *CQ* 38: 164–85.
—— (1991), 'Ovid and the Fabii: Fasti 2,193–474', *CQ* 41: 150–68.
HARVEY, W.J. (1965), *Character and the Novel* (Ithaca).
HEINZE, R. (1960), 'Ovids elegische Erzählung', in E. Burck (ed.) *Vom Geist der Römertums* 308–403 (Stuttgart).
HERBERT-BROWN, G. (1994), *Ovid and the Fasti An Historical Study* (Oxford).
—— (2002), *Ovid's Fasti Historical Readings at its Bimillennium* (Oxford).
HERTER, H. (1941), 'Ovids Persephone-Erzählungen und ihre hellenistische Quellen', *RhM* 90: 236–68.
HIGGINS, L.A. and SILVER, B.R. eds. (1991), *Rape and Representation* (New York).
HINDS, S.E. (1987a), 'Generalizing about Ovid', *Ramus* 16: 4–31.
—— (1987b), *The Metamorphosis of Persephone* (Cambridge).
—— (1992), '*Arma* in Ovid's *Fasti*', *Arethusa* 25: 81–149.
—— (1998), *Allusion and Intertext* (Cambridge).
HOFMANN, H. (1981), 'Ovids Metamorphosen (1950–1979)', *ANRW* 2.31.4: 2161–2273.
HOLZBERG, N. (1997), *Ovid Dichter und Werk* (Munich).
HOPKINSON, N. (1988), *A Hellenistic Anthology* (Cambridge).
JACOBSON, H. (1974), *Ovid's Heroides* (Princeton).
JANKA, M. (1997), *Ovid Ars Amatoria Buch 2 Kommentar* (Heidelberg).
JOHNSON, W.R. (1996–7), 'The rapes of Callisto', *CJ* 92: 9–24.
de JONG, I.J.F. (1987), *Narrators And Focalizers* (Amsterdam).
KEITH, A.M. (2000), *Engendering Rome* (Cambridge).
KERMODE, F. (1967), *The Sense of an Ending: Studies in the Theory of Fiction* (New York).
KRÄMER, H.J. (1965), 'Die Sage von Romulus und Remus in der lateinischen Literatur', in H. Flashar + K. Gaiser (ed.) *Synusia: Festgabe W. Schadewaldt* 367–76 (Pfullingen).
LAIOU, A.E., ed. (1993), *Consent and Coercion to Sex and Marriage in Ancient and Mediaeval Societies* (Washington).
LAMACCHIA, R. (1960), 'Ovidio interprete di Virgilio', *Maia* 12: 310–30.
LANDOLFI, L. (1997), 'Le molte Arianne di Ovidio', *QUCC* 57: 139–172.
LE BONNIEC, H. (1965), *P. Ovidius Naso Fastorum Liber Primus* (Paris).
—— (1969), *P. Ovidius Naso Fastorum Liber Secundus* (Paris).
—— (1989), *Etudes ovidiennes; introduction aux Fastes d'Ovide* (Frankfurt am Main).
LEE, A.G. (1953), 'Ovid's Lucretia', *G&R* 22: 107–118.
LEGLISE, P. (1958), *Une Oeuvre de Pré-cinéma L'Eneide* (Paris).
LIPOVSKY, J. (1981), *A Historiographical Study of Livy Books VI–X* (New York).
LITTLEWOOD, R.J. (1980), 'Ovid and the Ides of March' in C. Deroux (ed.) *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History II* 301–21 (Brussels).
—— (1981), 'Poetic artistry and dynastic politics: Ovid at the Ludi Megalenses (*Fasti* 4.179–372)', *CQ* 31: 381–95.
LOWE, N.J. (2000), *The Classical Plot and the Invention of Western Narrative* (Cambridge).
LUCE, T.J. (1977), *Livy The Composition of his History* (Princeton).
LYNE, R.O.A.M. (1987), *Further Voices in Vergil's Aeneid* (Oxford).
MACK, S. (1988), *Ovid* (New Haven and London).
MALISSARD, A. (1970), 'Homère, Virgile et le langage cinématographique', *Caesarodunum* 5: 155–69.

MARCHESI, C. (1910), 'Leggende Romane nei Fasti di Ovidio', *A&R* 13: 110–119.

McKEOWN, J.C. (1984), '*Fabula proposito nulla tegenda meo*: Ovid's *Fasti* and Augustan politics', in A. Woodman + D. West (edd.) *Poetry and politics in the age of Augustus* 169–87 (Cambridge).

—— (1987), *Ovid: Amores Volume I Text and Prolegomena* (Liverpool).

—— (1989), *Ovid: Amores Volume II A Commentary on Book One* (Leeds).

MERLI, E. (1999), 'HEROI RES ERAT ISTA PEDIS', *Philologus* 143: 68–86.

—— (2000), *Arma canant alii Materia epica e narrazione elegiaca nei fasti di Ovidio* (Florence).

MILES, G.B. (1995), *Livy Reconstructing Early Rome* (Ithaca NY and London).

MILLER, J.F. (1983), 'Ovid's divine interlocutors in the *Fasti*', in C. Deroux (ed.) *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History III* 156–92 (Brussels).

—— (1991), *Ovid's Elegiac Festivals* (Frankfurt am Main).

—— (1993), 'Ovidian Allusion', *MD* 30:153–64.

MURGATROYD, P. (1975), 'Militia Amoris and the Roman Elegists', *Latomus* 34: 59–79.

—— (1979), *Tibullus I* (Pietermaritzburg, reprinted Bristol, 1991).

—— (1992), 'Setting in six versions of the Hylas myth', in C. Deroux (ed.) *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History VI* 84–93 (Brussels).

—— (1994a), *Tibullus: Elegies II* (Oxford).

—— (1994b), 'Deception and Double Allusion in Ovid A.A. 1.527–564', *Mnemosyne* 47,1: 87–93.

—— (2000), Plotting in Ovidian Rape Narratives', *Eranos* 98: 75–92.

MUSGROVE, M.W. (1997), 'Perspective in Metamorphoses 12.11–23', *AJPh* 118: 267–83.

MYERS, K.S. (1994), *Ovid's Causes* (Ann Arbor).

—— (1999), 'The Metamorphosis of a Poet: Recent Work on Ovid', *JRS* 89: 190–204.

MYNORS, R.A.B. (1994), *Virgil Georgics* (Oxford).

NAGLE, B.R. (1995), *Ovid's Fasti Roman Holidays* (Bloomington).

NEUMEISTER, C. (1986), 'Orpheus und Eurydike. Eine Vergil-Parodie Ovids', *WJA* 12: 169–81.

NEWLANDS, C.E. (1996), *Playing With Time* (Ithaca, NY).

NORDEN, E. (1957), *P. Vergilius Maro Aeneis Buch VI* (Stuttgart).

NUTTALL, A.D. (1992), *Openings Narrative Beginnings from the Epic to the Novel* (Oxford).

OAKLEY, S.P. (1997), *A Commentary on Livy Books VI–X* (Oxford).

OGILVIE, R.M. (1965), *A Commentary on Livy: Books 1–5* (Oxford).

O'HARA, J. (1995–6), 'Vergil's best reader?: Ovidian commentary on Vergilian etymological wordplay', *CJ* 91,3: 255–76.

OMITOWOJU, R. (2002), *Rape and the Politics of Consent in Classical Athens* (Cambridge).

OTIS, B. (1970), *Ovid as an Epic Poet* (Cambridge).

OZ, A. (1999), *The Story Begins*, trans. M. Bar-Tura (New York, San Diego, London).

PARKER, H.C. (1999), 'The Romanization of Ino (*Fasti* 6,475–550)', *Latomus* 58: 336–47.

PARRY, H. (1964), 'Ovid's Metamorphoses: Violence in a pastoral Landscape', *TAPhA* 95: 268–82.

PEETERS, F. (1939), *Les Fastes d'Ovide* (Brussels).

PELLING, C., ed. (1990), *Characterization and Individularity in Greek Literature* (Oxford).

PERUTELLI, A. (1995), 'Il mito di Orfeo tra Virgilio e Ovidio' in *Atti del convegno nazionale Intertestualità* 199–212 (Amsterdam).

PHILLIPS, J.E. (1982), 'Current Research in Livy's First Decade', *ANRW* II.30.2: 998–1057.

PIGHI, G.B. (1973), *P. Ovidii Nasonis Fastorum Libri* (Turin).

PLATNAUER, M. (1951), *Latin Elegiac Verse* (Cambridge).

PLETT, H.F. (1991), *Intertextuality* (Berlin).

PORTE, D. (1985), *L'Étiologie Religieuse dans les Fastes d'Ovide* (Paris).
PRINCE, G. (1982), *Narratology* (New York).
PROPP, V. (1968), *Morphology of the Folktale*, trans. L. Scott (Austin, Texas).
PUCCI, P. (1987), *Odysseus Polutropos Intertextual Readings in the Odyssey and the Iliad* (Ithaca, NY).
RACE, W.H. (1992), 'How Greek poems begin', *YClS* 29: 13–38.
RAMAGLIA, L. (1958), 'La Leggenda di Evandro', *RSC* 6: 59–62.
REECE, S. (1993), *Stranger's Welcome: oral theory and the aesthetics of the Homeric hospitality scene* (Ann Arbor).
REESON, J. (2001), *Ovid Heroides 11, 13 and 14 A Commentary* (Leiden).
RICHARDSON, S. (1990), *The Homeric Narrator* (Nashville).
RICHLIN, A., ed. (1992), *Pornography and Representation in Greece and Rome* (Oxford and New York).
RICHTER, D.H. (1974), *Fable's End Completeness and Closure in Rhetorical Fiction* (Chicago and London).
RIMMON-KENAN, S. (1983), *Narrative Fiction: Contemporary Poetics* (London).
ROBERTS, D.H., DUNN, F.M. & FOWLER, D.P. edds. (1997), *Classical Closure Reading the End in Greek and Latin Literature* (Princeton).
ROSIVACH, V.J. (1998), *When A Young Man Falls In Love: The Sexual Exploitation Of Women in New Comedy* (London and New York).
RUTLEDGE, E.S. (1980), 'Ovid's Informants in the Fasti', in C. Deroux (ed.) *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History II* 322–31 (Brussels).
SAID, E.W. (1975), *Beginnings Intention and Method* (New York).
SALZMAN, M.R. (1998), 'Deification in the Fasti and the Metamorphoses' in C. Deroux (ed.) *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History IX* (Brussels).
SANTINI, C. (1973), 'Toni e strutture nella rappresentazione delle divinità nei Fasti', *GIF* 25: 41–62.
SCAFURO, A. (1990), 'Discourses of Sexual Violation in Mythic Accounts and Dramatic Versions of "The Girl's Tragedy"', *Differences* 2: 126–59.
SCHENKL, K. (1860), 'Ovidius (Fasti) und Livius', *Zeitschrift für die österreichischen Gymnasien* 11: 401–6.
SCHILLING, R. (1990), 'Virgilio e Ovidio, poeta dei Fasti' in M. Gigante (ed.) *Virgilio e gli Augustei* 223–55 (Naples).
—— (1993), *Ovide Les Fastes* (Paris).
SCHMITZER, U. (2001), *Ovid* (Hildesheim).
SCHOLES, R. (1974), *Structuralism in Literature An Introduction* (New Haven and London).
SCHUBERT, W. (1991), 'Zur Sage von Hercules und Cacus bei Vergil (Aen. 8.184–279) und Ovid (Fast. 1.543–586)', *JAC* 6: 37–60.
SHARROCK, A. and MORALES, H., eds. (2000), *Intratextuality* (Oxford).
SMITH, B.H. (1968), *Poetic Closure: A Study Of How Poems End* (Chicago).
SMITH, R.A. (1997), *Poetic Allusion and Poetic Embrace in Ovid and Virgil* (Ann Arbor).
SOFER, E. (1905/6), *Livius als Quelle von Ovids Fasten* (Vienna).
SOLODOW, J.B. (1988), *The World of Ovid's Metamorphoses* (Chapel Hill).
SPINA, L., ed. (1999), *La fine dell'inizio. Una riflessione e quattro studi su incipit ed explicit nella letteratura latina* (Naples).
STEUDEL, M. (1992), *Die Literaturparodie in Ovids Ars Amatoria* (Hildesheim).
STIRRUP, B.E. (1977), 'Techniques of Rape. Variety of Wit in Ovid's Metamorphoses', *G&R* 24: 170–84.
STRELKE, J. ed. (1971), *Patterns of Literary Style* (University Park, Pennsylvania).
SUERBAUM, W. (1980), 'Hundert Jahre Vergil-Forschung', *ANRW* 2.31.1: 3–358.
THOMAS, R.F. (1999), *Reading Virgil and His Texts Studies in Intertextuality* (Ann Arbor).
TISSOL, G. (1993), 'Ovid's little Aeneid and the thematic integrity of the *Metamorphoses*', *Helios* 20: 69–79.

—— (1997), *The Face of Nature* (Princeton).
TODOROV, T. ed. (1982), *French Literary Theory Today* (Cambridge).
TOOHEY, P. (1996), *Epic Lessons* (London).
TOOLAN, M.J. (1988), *Narrative A Critical Linguistic Introduction* (London and New York).
TORGOVNICH, M. (1981), *Closure in the Novel* (Princeton).
VIARRE, S. (1964), *L'Image et La Pensée dans les Métamorphoses D'Ovide* (Paris).
WALL, K. (1988), *The Callisto Myth from Ovid to Atwood* (Kingston and Montreal).
WALLACE-HADRILL, A. (1987), 'Time for Augustus', in M. Whitby et al. (eds.) *Homo Viator: Classical Essays for John Bramble* (Bristol and Oak Park, Il.), 221–30.
WALSH, P.G. (1961), *Livy His Historical Aims and Methods* (Cambridge).
WARDMAN, A.E. (1965), 'The Rape of the Sabines', *CQ* 15: 101–3.
WEST, D. and WOODMAN, A.J., eds. (1979), *Creative Imitation and Latin Literature* (Cambridge).
WHEELER, S.M. (1999), *A Discourse of Wonders* (Philadelphia).
WILKINSON, L.P. (1969), *The Georgics of Virgil A Critical Survey* (Cambridge).
WILLIAMS, G.D. (1991), 'Vocal Variations and Narrative Complexity in Ovid's Vestalia: Fasti 6.249–468', *Ramus* 20: 183–204.
WINKLER, M.M. ed. (2001), *Classical Myth and Culture in the Cinema* (Oxford).
WORMELL, D.E.W. (1979), 'Ovid and the *Fasti*', *Hermathena* 127: 39–50.
WOYTEK, E. (1994), 'Ovidius Sui Imitator', *Wiener humanistische Blätter* 36: 44–64.
WYKE, M. ed. (1998), *Parchments of Gender: Deciphering the Bodies of Antiquity* (Oxford).
ZINN, E., ed. (1970), *Ovids Ars amatoria und Remedia amoris* (Stuttgart).
ZIOLKOWSKI, T. (1983), *Varieties of Literary Thematics* (Princeton).

GENERAL INDEX

Achilles 4, 17f., 144f.
actant model 151ff.
aemulatio 107f., 181, 188
Aeneas 44, 90, 104ff., 114ff., 120ff., 127, 130f.
Alexandrian footnote 205
Amata 125
Amulius 160
analepsis 18ff.
Anna 111f., 114f., 121f., 125f., 126f., 129f., 148f., 155f.
aperture 207ff.
Apollonius Rhodius 144 n.11
Aratus 2
Ariadne 19f., 263ff., 285
Arion 16, 220f.
Aristaeus 14f., 109f., 227f.
asyndeton 25
Attis 42f.
Augustus 92ff.

Bacchus 57ff., 150f.

Cacus 36f., 107ff., 116f.
Callimachus 2, 27 n.1, 29, 41, 47
Calliope 47ff., 251
Callisto 75, 216
Carmentis 34ff., 58, 115f., 123f., 127ff., 277
Castor 56f.
Catullus 42f., 45 n.36, 117f., 263ff.
Ceres 79f., 106f., 161ff., 249ff.
characterization 141ff., 195ff., 203f., 250ff.
Chiron 4, 17f., 144f.
Cicero 89
cinematic techniques 14ff.
close-up 17f.
closure 10f., 204f., 240f., 243, 269ff.
Collatinus 195
colouring 219ff.
compression 188f., 254
contamination 116ff., 135f., 139
Cranae 21f., 74f., 149f.
cutting 16f.
Cybele 41ff., 148

deception, of reader 34, 103ff., 226ff., 240f.
  see also teasing
description 3ff., 217ff.
developed characters 163ff.
Dido 111f., 122f., 125, 131
Dionysius of Halicarnassus 116f.
direct characterization 142f., 167
Dis 157
duration 20f.

early Rome, Ovid's picture of 172f.
effet de réel 3 n.5
Egeria 39ff.
elided characters 156ff.
ellipse 20
Ennius 89, 185f., 226 n.43, 245 n.29
epic tone 185f.
Erato 41ff.
establishing shot 17
Evander 34ff., 122 n.45, 123f., 127ff.
expansion of episode 127ff.

Fabii 158, 181ff., 221
fade-out 15
false closure 244, 281ff.
Faunus 8f., 84f., 112f., 223f.
feminist criticism 64ff.
flashback 18ff.
flashforward 18f.
  see also foreshadowing
Flora 32, 49ff., 147f.
focalization 28, 58
foreshadowing 79, 102f., 134f., 145, 162, 191f., 223, 231–232, 255, 266–267, 282
  see also flashforward
freeze frame 18
frequency 21f.
functions 67ff.

Helper 72–73, 152, 154ff.
Hercules 4, 7, 17f., 36f., 58, 116f., 147, 223f.
Hersilia 145ff., 244f.
Hesiod 47ff., 104 n.14

high angle shot 15f.
Homer 44, 136, 139f., 185
Homeric Hymns 89, 162 n.57, 250
hook (narrative) 222ff.
Horace 89, 135, 255 n.56
Hyas 11
Hyrieus 157

indirect characterization 142, 216
Ino 57f., 150f., 222, 243
inspiration (divine) 29, 208f.
inspirers (of narratives) 28ff.
interfigurality 119ff., 136, 139 n.91
intertextuality 97ff., 171ff.
irony 192f., 241

Janus 32ff., 74f., 149
Juno 51f., 58f., 243
Jupiter 77f., 80f., 132f., 157f.
Juturna 76ff., 90, 109, 132f.

Lara 76ff., 90, 133
Lavinia 121f., 131
Lemuria 52
lighting 15
Livy 33, 44, 116f., 171ff., 286f.
looking through 117f., 136, 139f., 260
low angle shot 15f.
low key 15
Lucretia 15, 75f., 191ff.
Lucretius 89, 119 n.39

Maiestas 46f.
Maius 46f.
Mars 37ff., 51f., 70, 91f., 95, 111, 145ff., 147, 224f.
Marsyas 61f.
Mercury 29, 52ff., 56f., 78
Mezentius 104f., 120f.
Minerva 59ff., 224f.
minimized characters 156ff.
minor characters 159ff., 195
mise-en-scène 31
montage 16
mood 225ff.
Moschus 241
mythical world of Fasti 141, 172f.

narrative
  definition of 1
  general characteristics of in Fasti 2f.
  hook 222ff.
narrator
  biased 37ff., 57f.
  heterodiegetic 30, 41
  homodiegetic 30
  internal 27ff.
  omniscient 30
  Ovid as 27 n.1
  self-conscious 38
  uninterested 59ff.
  unreliable 28, 35, 37, 45–46, 51, 55f., 56
Numa 39ff., 102

oppositio in imitando 105f., 135
Orion 157

pace 15, 23
parody 111ff., 135
pause (descriptive) 143
placement 9ff.
point of view 28, 58
polemical engagement 109ff.
polytonality 74ff.
Pollux 56f.
Polyhymnia 46f.
preamble 208ff.
prequel 131ff.
Priapus 81ff.
prolepsis 18f.
  see also foreshadowing
Propertius 2, 27 n.1, 33, 116f., 119, 135
Proserpine 78ff.
Proteus 109f., 228
pull-back dolly 18

Quinquatrus 59ff.
Quirinus 44f.
  see also Romulus

rape 63ff.
rapidity 23ff.
reaction shot 18
Remus 12, 44f., 52ff., 175
remythologization 172, 175, 185
renarration 180ff., 235ff.
reprise 126ff., 138f., 253ff.
retrospective intertextuality 129, 132, 181
Rhea Silvia 7, 91f.
Romulus 44f., 52ff., 146f., 147, 174ff.
Romulus' wife 145ff., 244f.

Sabine women 8, 37ff., 145ff., 255ff.
scene 20f.
screech-owl 4f.
segmented narration 255ff., 263ff.
self-imitation 235ff.
sequel 129ff.
Servius Tullius 201ff.
Sextus 75f., 101, 163ff., 190, 195ff.
simile 23 n.69, 184f., 199
simultaneous allusion 113ff.
  see also looking through
skimming 20f.
space 6ff.
strix 4f.
subversion 91ff.
summary 20f.
synecdoche 143

Tarpeia 32f.
Tarquinius Superbus 163, 167 n.71, 203f.
teasing, of reader 45, 52, 54, 60f., 62, 70, 74, 83, 100, 151, 157, 188, 240, 278ff., 282ff.
  see also deception
terminal motifs 273
Tiber 55f.
Tibullus 27 n.1, 119 n.39, 139 n.90, 260
time 18ff.
Tullia 201ff., 216f.
Turnus 90, 122f.

variation 105ff., 135
Vesta 85ff.
Virgil 35, 36f., 44, 55, 89ff., 97ff., 185f., 225, 226 n.43, 228, 255 n.56

wolf (of Romulus and Remus) 161

Zephyrus 49ff.
zoom-in 17f., 219

INDEX OF OVIDIAN LINES DISCUSSED

A.A. 1.101ff. 255ff.
A.A. 1.527ff. 263ff.
A.A. 1.529 261
A.A. 2.209 259
A.A. 3.505 247
Am. 1.5.9 261
Am. 1.6.46 80
Am. 3.4.22 260 n.71
Am. 3.10.36 259f.
Am. 3.11.16 267
Am. 3.14.37f. 260f.

Fasti 1.259ff. 32ff., 179, 237 n.9, 255ff.
Fasti 1.363ff. 14f., 109f., 133ff., 140, 209, 227f.
Fasti 1.393ff. 12, 70, 73, 81ff., 89, 95, 159, 226f., 237, 276
Fasti 1.469ff. 34f., 115f., 118f., 123f., 127ff.
Fasti 1.543ff. 36f., 107ff., 116f., 211f., 277
Fasti 2.83ff. 13, 16, 211–212, 220f., 276, 286
Fasti 2.155ff. 19, 71, 73, 75, 89, 93f., 153f., 157f., 216, 238 n.10, 247ff., 260 n.17, 274 n.13
Fasti 2.195ff. 158, 181ff., 212, 221, 283, 286
Fasti 2.247ff. 154f.
Fasti 2.305ff. 8f., 72, 84f., 93, 95, 112f., 158 n.47, 211, 223f., 253ff., 259, 270ff., 282f.
Fasti 2.361ff. 12
Fasti 2.383ff. 159ff., 179
Fasti 2.429ff. 117f., 255ff.
Fasti 2.459ff. 12ff., 19
Fasti 2.481ff. 211, 227, 244f., 285
Fasti 2.585ff. 71f., 73, 76ff., 89ff., 93, 95, 109, 132f., 152f., 210f., 226, 283
Fasti 2.687ff. 19, 21, 101, 152, 163f., 187ff., 211, 229ff.
Fasti 2.711ff. 10, 19, 21, 69, 71f., 73, 75f., 95, 164ff., 191ff., 231ff., 260f., 286f.
Fasti 3.11ff. 7f., 15, 19, 69f., 72, 91f., 95, 218 n.25, 278ff.
Fasti 3.49ff. 212, 280f.
Fasti 3.179ff. 8, 37ff., 145ff., 179, 255ff., 283
Fasti 3.277ff. 16, 39ff., 102, 136ff.
Fasti 3.461ff. 18, 19f., 212, 263ff., 285
Fasti 3.545ff. 6, 105f., 114f., 121f., 123, 124f., 126f., 129ff., 155f., 212f., 261, 283
Fasti 3.663ff. 148
Fasti 3.677ff. 11, 111f., 224f.
Fasti 3.737ff. 100, 283f.
Fasti 3.795ff. 103f.
Fasti 3.853ff. 10f., 16, 150f., 222, 261ff.
Fasti 4.197ff. 41f.
Fasti 4.223ff. 42f., 274 n.13, 276
Fasti 4.249ff. 7, 15, 43f.
Fasti 4.419ff. 7, 69, 72, 78ff., 88, 100, 106f., 157, 161ff., 217ff., 237 n.9, 241 n.16, 249ff., 259f., 261f.
Fasti 4.641ff. 6, 11 n.32, 102f., 217
Fasti 4.809ff. 44f.
Fasti 4.879ff. 104f., 120f.
Fasti 5.11ff. 10, 46f., 213f.
Fasti 5.81ff. 47ff.
Fasti 5.169ff. 11f.
Fasti 5.195ff. 12, 16, 49ff., 71–72, 89, 95
Fasti 5.231ff. 51f.
Fasti 5.381ff. 4, 17f., 144f.
Fasti 5.451ff. 29, 52ff., 226
Fasti 5.495ff. 6, 100, 157, 274
Fasti 5.605ff. 20, 69–70, 72, 88, 158 n.47, 214, 239 n.11, 239ff.
Fasti 5.639ff. 55f.
Fasti 5.669ff. 10, 56f.
Fasti 6.105ff. 21f., 70, 74f., 95, 149, 226
Fasti 6.131ff. 4f., 100f., 149f.
Fasti 6.321ff. 85ff., 91–92, 95
Fasti 6.351ff. 179
Fasti 6.419ff. 17f.
Fasti 6.485ff. 57ff., 150f., 209, 215, 237 n.9 and n.10, 239 n.11, 241 n.16, 243, 275
Fasti 6.587ff. 201ff., 216f.
Fasti 6.657ff. 59ff.
Fasti 6.697ff. 61f., 238 n.10, 245ff.
Fasti 6.737ff. 238f., 241 n.16, 274

Her. 6.41 267
Her. 7.195f. 213
Her. 9 253ff.
Her. 9.121 267
Her. 10 263ff.

Met. 2.401ff. 247ff.
Met. 2.836ff. 239ff.
Met. 4.416ff. 243
Met. 4.590 262
Met. 5.346ff. 249ff.
Met. 6.383ff. 245ff.
Met. 8.169ff. 263f.
Met. 9.342ff. 237
Met. 14.775ff. 255ff.
Met. 14.805ff. 244f.
Met. 15. 497ff. 238f.

Tristia 1.3.78 262f.

SUPPLEMENTS TO MNEMOSYNE

EDITED BY H. PINKSTER, H.S. VERSNEL,
I.J.F. DE JONG AND P. H. SCHRIJVERS

Recent volumes in the series

100. OPHUIJSEN, J.M. VAN. *Hephaistion on Metre.* Translation and Commentary. 1987. ISBN 90 04 08452 5
101. VERDENIUS, W.J. *Commentaries on Pindar. Vol. II.* Olympian Odes 1, 10, 11, Nemean 11, Isthmian 2. 1988. ISBN 90 04 08535 1
102. LUSCHNIG, C.A.E. *Time holds the Mirror. A Study of Knowledge in Euripides' 'Hippolytus'.* 1988. ISBN 90 04 08601 3
103. MARCOVICH, M. *Alcestis Barcinonensis.* Text and Commentary. 1988. ISBN 90 04 08600 5
104. HOLT, F.L. *Alexander the Great and Bactria.* The Formation of a Greek Frontier in Cen-tral Asia. Repr. 1993. ISBN 90 04 08612 9
105. BILLERBECK, M. *Seneca's Tragödien; sprachliche und stilistische Untersuchungen.* Mit Anhängen zur Sprache des Hercules Oetaeus und der Octavia. 1988. ISBN 90 04 08631 5
106. ARENDS, J.F.M. *Die Einheit der Polis. Eine Studie über Platons Staat.* 1988. ISBN 90 04 08785 0
107. BOTER, G.J. *The Textual Tradition of Plato's Republic.* 1988. ISBN 90 04 08787 7
108. WHEELER, E.L. *Stratagem and the Vocabulary of Military Trickery.* 1988. ISBN 90 04 08831 8
109. BUCKLER, J. *Philip II and the Sacred War.* 1989. ISBN 90 04 09095 9
110. FULLERTON, M.D. *The Archaistic Style in Roman Statuary.* 1990. ISBN 90 04 09146 7
111. ROTHWELL, K.S. *Politics and Persuasion in Aristophanes' 'Ecclesiazusae'.* 1990. ISBN 90 04 09185 8
112. CALDER, W.M. & A. DEMANDT. *Eduard Meyer.* Leben und Leistung eines Universalhistorikers. 1990. ISBN 90 04 09131 9
113. CHAMBERS, M.H. *Georg Busolt. His Career in His Letters.* 1990. ISBN 90 04 09225 0
114. CASWELL, C.P. *A Study of 'Thumos' in Early Greek Epic.* 1990. ISBN 90 04 09260 9
115. EINGARTNER, J. *Isis und ihre Dienerinnen in der Kunst der Römischen Kaiserzeit.* 1991. ISBN 90 04 09312 5
116. JONG, I. DE. *Narrative in Drama.* The Art of the Euripidean Messenger-Speech. 1991. ISBN 90 04 09406 7
117. BOYCE, B.T. *The Language of the Freedmen in Petronius'* Cena Trimalchionis. 1991. ISBN 90 04 09431 8
118. RÜTTEN, Th. *Demokrit — lachender Philosoph und sanguinischer Melancholiker.* 1992. ISBN 90 04 09523 3
119. KARAVITES, P. (with the collaboration of Th. Wren). *Promise-Giving and Treaty-Making.* Homer and the Near East. 1992. ISBN 90 04 09567 5
120. SANTORO L'HOIR, F. *The Rhetoric of Gender Terms.* 'Man', 'Woman' and the portrayal of character in Latin prose. 1992. ISBN 90 04 09512 8
121. WALLINGA, H.T. *Ships and Sea-Power before the Great Persian War.* The Ancestry of the Ancient Trireme. 1993. ISBN 90 04 09650 7
122. FARRON, S. *Vergil's Æneid: A Poem of Grief and Love.* 1993. ISBN 90 04 09661 2
123. LÉTOUBLON, F. *Les lieux communs du roman.* Stéréotypes grecs d'aventure et d'amour. 1993. ISBN 90 04 09724 4
124. KUNTZ, M. *Narrative Setting and Dramatic Poetry.* 1993. ISBN 90 04 09784 8

125. THEOPHRASTUS. *Metaphysics.* With an Introduction, Translation and Commentary by Marlein van Raalte. 1993. ISBN 90 04 09786 4
126. THIERMANN, P. *Die* Orationes Homeri *des Leonardo Bruni Aretino.* Kritische Edition der lateinischen und kastilianischen Übersetzung mit Prolegomena und Kommentar. 1993. ISBN 90 04 09719 8
127. LEVENE, D.S. *Religion in Livy.* 1993. ISBN 90 04 09617 5
128. PORTER,J.R. *Studies in Euripides'* Orestes. 1993. ISBN 90 04 09662 0
129. SICKING, C.M.J. & J.M. VAN OPHUIJSEN. *Two Studies in Attic Particle Usage.* Lysias and Plato. 1993. ISBN 90 04 09867 4
130. JONG, I.J.F. DE, & J.P. SULLIVAN (eds.). *Modern Critical Theory and Classical Literature.* 1994. ISBN 90 04 09571 3
131. YAMAGATA, N. *Homeric Morality.* 1994. ISBN 90 04 09872 0
132. KOVACS, D. *Euripidea.* 1994. ISBN 90 04 09926 3
133. SUSSMAN, L.A. *The Declamations of Calpurnius Flaccus.* Text, Translation, and Commentary. 1994. ISBN 90 04 09983 2
134. SMOLENAARS,J.J.L. *Statius*: Thebaid VII. A Commentary. 1994.ISBN 90 04 10029 6
135. SMALL, D.B. (ed.). *Methods in the Mediterranean.* Historical and Archaeological Views on Texts and Archaeology. 1995. ISBN 90 04 09581 0
136. DOMINIK, W.J. *The Mythic Voice of Statius.* Power and Politics in the *Thebaid.* 1994. ISBN 90 04 09972 7
137. SLINGS, S.R. *Plato's Apology of Socrates.* A Literary and Philosophical Study with a Running Commentary. Edited and Completed from the Papers of the Late E. De Strycker, s.j. 1994. ISBN 90 04 10103 9
138. FRANK, M. *Seneca's* Phoenissae. Introduction and Commentary. 1995. ISBN 90 04 09776 7
139. MALKIN, I. & Z.W. RUBINSOHN (eds.). *Leaders and Masses in the Roman World.* Studies in Honor of Zvi Yavetz. 1995. ISBN 90 04 09917 4
140. SEGAL, A. *Theatres in Roman Palestine and Provincia Arabia.* 1995. ISBN 90 04 10145 4
141. CAMPBELL, M. *A Commentary on Apollonius Rhodius* Argonautica III 1-471. 1994. ISBN 90 04 10158 6
142. DeFOREST, M.M. *Apollonius'* Argonautica: *A Callimachean Epic.* 1994. ISBN 90 04 10017 2
143. WATSON, P.A. *Ancient Stepmothers.* Myth, Misogyny and Reality. 1995. ISBN 90 04 10176 4
144. SULLIVAN, S.D. *Psychological and Ethical Ideas.* What Early Greeks Say. 1995. ISBN 90 04 10185 3
145. CARGILL,J. *Athenian Settlements of the Fourth Century B.C.* 1995. ISBN 90 04 09991 3
146. PANAYOTAKIS, C. *Theatrum Arbitri.* Theatrical Elements in the *Satyrica* of Petronius. 1995. ISBN 90 04 10229 9
147. GARRISON, E.P. *Groaning Tears.* Ethical and Dramatic Aspects of Suicide in Greek Tragedy. 1995. 90 04 10241 8
148. OLSON, S.D. *Blood and Iron.* Stories and Storytelling in Homer's *Odyssey.* 1995. ISBN 90 04 10251 5
149. VINOGRADOV, J.G.& S.D. KRYZICKIJ (eds.). *Olbia.* Eine altgriechische Stadt im Nordwestlichen Schwarzmeerraum. 1995. ISBN 90 04 09677 9
150. MAURER, K. *Interpolation in Thucydides.* 1995. ISBN 90 04 10300 7
151. HORSFALL, N. (ed.) *A Companion to the Study of Virgil.* 1995 ISBN 90 04 09559 4
152. KNIGHT, V.H. *The Renewal of Epic.* Responses to Homer in the *Argonautica* of Apollo-nius. 1995. ISBN 90 04 10386 4
153. LUSCHNIG, C.A.E. *The Gorgon's Severed Head.* Studies of *Alcestis*, *Electra*, and *Phoenissae.* 1995. ISBN 90 04 10382 1
154. NAVARRO ANTOLÍN, F. (ed.). *Lygdamus.* Corpus Tibullianum III. 1-6: Lygdami elegiarum liber. Translated byJ.J. Zoltowski. 1996. ISBN 90 04 10210 8

155. MATTHEWS, V.J. *Antimachus of Colophon.* Text and Commentary. 1996. ISBN 90 04 10468 2
156. TREISTER, M.Y. *The Role of Metals in Ancient Greek History.* 1996. ISBN 90 04 10473 9
157. WORTHINGTON, I. (ed.). *Voice into Text.* Orality and Literacy in Ancient Greece. 1996. ISBN 90 04 10431 3
158. WIJSMAN, H.J.W. *Valerius Flaccus*, Argonautica, *Book V.* A Commentary. 1996. ISBN 90 04 10506 9
159. SCHMELING, G. (ed.). *The Novel in the Ancient World.* 1996. ISBN 90 04 09630 2
160. SICKING, C.M.J. & P. STORK. *Two Studies in the Semantics of the Verb in Classical Greek.* 1996. ISBN 90 04 10460 7
161. KOVACS, D. *Euripidea Altera.* 1996. ISBN 90 04 10624 3
162. GERA, D. *Warrior Women.* The Anonymous Tractatus *De Mulieribus.* 1997. ISBN 90 04 10665 0
163. MORRIS, I. & B. POWELL (eds.). *A New Companion to Homer.* 1997. ISBN 90 04 09989 1
164. ORLIN, E.M. *Temples, Religion and Politics in the Roman Republic.* 1997.ISBN 90 04 10708 8
165. ALBRECHT, M. VON. *A History of Roman Literature.* From Livius Andronicus to Boethius with Special Regard to Its Influence on World Literature. 2 Vols.Revised by G.Schmeling and by the Author. Vol. 1: Translated with the Assistance of F. and K. Newman, Vol. 2: Translated with the Assitance of R.R. Caston and F.R. Schwartz. 1997. ISBN 90 04 10709 6 (Vol. 1), ISBN 90 04 10711 8 (Vol. 2), ISBN 90 04 10712 6 (Set)
166. DIJK, J.G.M. VAN. Αἶνοι, Λόγοι, Μῦθοι. Fables in Archaic, Classical, and Hellenistic Greek Literature. With a Study of the Theory and Terminology of the Genre. 1997. ISBN 90 04 10747 9
167. MAEHLER, H. (Hrsg.). *Die Lieder des Bakchylides.* Zweiter Teil: Die Dithyramben und Fragmente. Text, Übersetzung und Kommentar. 1997. ISBN 90 04 10671 5
168. DILTS, M. & G.A. KENNEDY (eds.). *Two Greek Rhetorical Treatises from the Roman Empire.* Introduction, Text, and Translation of the Arts of Rhetoric Attributed to Anonymous Seguerianus and to Apsines of Gadara. 1997. ISBN 90 04 10728 2
169. GÜNTHER, H.-C. *Quaestiones Propertianae.* 1997. ISBN 90 04 10793 2
170. HEINZE, T. (Hrsg.). *P. Ovidius Naso. Der* XII. *Heroidenbrief: Medea an Jason.* Einleitung, Text und Kommentar. Mit einer Beilage: Die Fragmente der Tragödie *Medea.* 1997. ISBN 90 04 10800 9
171. BAKKER, E.J. (ed.). *Grammar as Interpretation.* Greek Literature in its Linguistic Contexts. 1997. ISBN 90 04 10730 4
172. GRAINGER, J.D. *A Seleukid Prosopography and Gazetteer.* 1997. ISBN 90 04 10799 1
173. GERBER, D.E. (ed.). *A Companion to the Greek Lyric Poets.* 1997. ISBN 90 04 09944 1
174. SANDY, G. *The Greek World of Apuleius.* Apuleius and the Second Sophistic. 1997. ISBN 90 04 10821 1
175. ROSSUM-STEENBEEK, M. VAN. *Greek Readers' Digests?* Studies on a Selection of Subliterary Papyri. 1998. ISBN 90 04 10953 6
176. McMAHON, J.M. *Paralysin Cave.* Impotence, Perception, and Text in the *Satyrica* of Petronius. 1998. ISBN 90 04 10825 4
177. ISAAC, B. *The Near East under Roman Rule.* Selected Papers. 1998. ISBN 90 04 10736 3
178. KEEN, A.G. *Dynastic Lycia.* A Political History of the Lycians and Their Relations with Foreign Powers, c. 545-362 B.C. 1998. ISBN 90 04 10956 0
179. GEORGIADOU, A. & D.H.J. LARMOUR. *Lucian's Science Fiction Novel* True Histories. Interpretation and Commentary. 1998. ISBN 90 04 10667 7
180. GÜNTHER, H.-C. *Ein neuer metrischer Traktat und das Studium der pindarischen Metrik in der Philologie der Paläologenzeit.* 1998. ISBN 90 04 11008 9
181. HUNT, T.J. *A Textual History of Cicero's* Academici Libri. 1998. ISBN 90 04 10970 6
182. HAMEL, D. *Athenian Generals.* Military Authority in the Classical Period. 1998. ISBN 90 04 10900 5

183. WHITBY, M. (ed.). *The Propaganda of Power.* The Role of Panegyric in Late Antiquity. 1998. ISBN 90 04 10571 9
184. SCHRIER, O.J. *The* Poetics *of Aristotle and the* Tractatus Coislinianus. A Bibliography from about 900 till 1996. 1998. ISBN 90 04 11132 8
185. SICKING, C.M.J. *Distant Companions.* Selected Papers. 1998. ISBN 90 04 11054 2
186. SCHRIJVERS, P.H. *Lucrèce et les Sciences de la Vie.* 1999. ISBN 90 04 10230 2
187. BILLERBECK M. (Hrsg.). *Seneca.* Hercules Furens. Einleitung, Text, Übersetzung und Kommentar. 1999. ISBN 90 04 11245 6
188. MACKAY, E.A. (ed.). *Signs of Orality.* The Oral Tradition and Its Influence in the Greek and Roman World. 1999. ISBN 90 04 11273 1
189. ALBRECHT, M. VON. *Roman Epic.* An Interpretative Introduction. 1999. ISBN 90 04 11292 8
190. HOUT, M.P.J. VAN DEN. *A Commentary on the Letters of M. Cornelius Fronto.* 1999. ISBN 90 04 10957 9
191. KRAUS, C. SHUTTLEWORTH. (ed.). *The Limits of Historiography.* Genre and Narrative in Ancient Historical Texts. 1999. ISBN 90 04 10670 7
192. LOMAS, K. & T. CORNELL. *Cities and Urbanisation in Ancient Italy.* ISBN 90 04 10808 4 *In preparation*
193. TSETSKHLADZE, G.R. (ed.). *History of Greek Colonization and Settlement Overseas.* 2 vols. ISBN 90 04 09843 7 *In preparation*
194. WOOD, S.E. *Imperial Women.* A Study in Public Images, 40 B.C. - A.D. 68. 1999. ISBN 90 04 11281 2
195. OPHUIJSEN, J.M. VAN & P. STORK. *Linguistics into Interpretation.* Speeches of War in Herodotus VII 5 & 8-18. 1999. ISBN 90 04 11455 6
196. TSETSKHLADZE, G.R. (ed.). *Ancient Greeks West and East.* 1999. ISBN 90 04 11190 5
197. PFEIJFFER, I.L. *Three Aeginetan Odes of Pindar.* A Commentary on *Nemean* V, *Nemean* III, & *Pythian* VIII. 1999. ISBN 90 04 11381 9
198. HORSFALL, N. *Virgil,* Aeneid 7. A Commentary. 2000. ISBN 90 04 10842 4
199. IRBY-MASSIE, G.L. *Military Religion in Roman Britain.* 1999. ISBN 90 04 10848 3
200. GRAINGER, J.D. *The League of the Aitolians.* 1999. ISBN 90 04 10911 0
201. ADRADOS, F.R. *History of the Graeco-Roman Fable.* I: Introduction and from the Origins to the Hellenistic Age. Translated by L.A. Ray. Revised and Updated by the Author and Gert-Jan van Dijk. 1999. ISBN 90 04 11454 8
202. GRAINGER, J.D. *Aitolian Prosopographical Studies.* 2000. ISBN 90 04 11350 9
203. SOLOMON, J. *Ptolemy* Harmonics. Translation and Commentary. 2000. ISBN 90 04 115919
204. WIJSMAN, H.J.W. *Valerius Flaccus,* Argonautica, *Book VI.* A Commentary. 2000. ISBN 90 04 11718 0
205. MADER, G. *Josephus and the Politics of Historiography.* Apologetic and Impression Management in the *Bellum Judaicum.* 2000. ISBN 90 04 11446 7
206. NAUTA, R.R. *Poetry for Patrons.* Literary Communication in the Age of Domitian. 2000. ISBN 90 04 10885 8
207. ADRADOS, F.R. *History of the Graeco-Roman Fable.* II: The Fable during the Roman Empire and in the Middle Ages. Translated by L.A. Ray. Revised and Updated by the Author and Gert-Jan van Dijk. 2000. ISBN 90 04 11583 8
208. JAMES, A. & K. LEE. *A Commentary on Quintus of Smyrna,* Posthomerica V. 2000. ISBN 90 04 11594 3
209. DERDERIAN, K. *Leaving Words to Remember.* Greek Mourning and the Advent of Literacy. 2001. ISBN 90 04 11750 4
210. SHORROCK, R. *The Challenge of Epic.* Allusive Engagement in the *Dionysiaca* of Nonnus. 2001. ISBN 90 04 11795 4
211. SCHEIDEL, W. (ed.). *Debating Roman Demography.* 2001. ISBN 90 04 11525 0

212. KEULEN, A.J. *L. Annaeus Seneca* Troades. Introduction, Text and Commentary. 2001. ISBN 90 04 12004 1
213. MORTON, J. *The Role of the Physical Environment in Ancient Greek Seafaring.* 2001. ISBN 90 04 11717 2
214. GRAHAM, A.J. *Collected Papers on Greek Colonization.* 2001. ISBN 90 04 11634 6
215. GROSSARDT, P. *Die Erzählung von Meleagros.* Zur literarischen Entwicklung der kalydonischen Kultlegende. 2001. ISBN 90 04 11952 3
216. ZAFIROPOULOS, C.A. *Ethics in Aesop's Fables: The* Augustana *Collection.* 2001. ISBN 90 04 11867 5
217. RENGAKOS, A. & T.D. PAPANGHELIS (eds.). *A Companion to Apollonius Rhodius.* 2001. ISBN 90 04 11752 0
218. WATSON, J. *Speaking Volumes.* Orality and Literacy in the Greek and Roman World. 2001. ISBN 90 04 12049 1
219. MACLEOD, L. *Dolos and Dike in Sophokles'* Elektra. 2001. ISBN 90 04 11898 5
220. MCKINLEY, K.L. *Reading the Ovidian Heroine.* "Metamorphoses" Commentaries 1100-1618. 2001. ISBN 90 04 11796 2
221. REESON, J. *Ovid* Heroides *11, 13 and 14.* A Commentary. 2001. ISBN 90 04 12140 4
222. FRIED, M.N. & S. UNGURU. *Apollonius of Perga's* Conica: Text, Context, Subtext. 2001. ISBN 90 04 11977 9
223. LIVINGSTONE, N. *A Commentary on Isocrates'* Busiris. 2001. ISBN 90 04 12143 9
224. LEVENE, D.S. & D.P. NELIS (eds.). *Clio and the Poets.* Augustan Poetry and the Traditions of Ancient Historiography. 2002. ISBN 90 04 11782 2
225. WOOTEN, C.W. *The Orator in Action and Theory in Greece and Rome.* 2001. ISBN 90 04 12213 3
226. GALÁN VIOQUE, G. *Martial, Book VII. A Commentary.* 2001. ISBN 90 04 12338 5
227. LEFÈVRE, E. *Die Unfähigkeit, sich zu erkennen: Sophokles' Tragödien.* 2001. ISBN 90 04 12322 9
228. SCHEIDEL, W. *Death on the Nile.* Disease and the Demography of Roman Egypt. 2001. ISBN 90 04 12323 7
229. SPANOUDAKIS, K. *Philitas of Cos.* 2002. ISBN 90 04 12428 4
230. WORTHINGTON, I. & J.M. FOLEY (eds.). *Epea and Grammata.* Oral and written Communication in Ancient Greece. 2002. ISBN 90 04 12455 1
231. McKECHNIE, P. (ed.). *Thinking Like a Lawyer.* Essays on Legal History and General History for John Crook on his Eightieth Birthday. 2002. ISBN 90 04 12474 8
232. GIBSON, R.K. & C. SHUTTLEWORTH KRAUS (eds.). *The Classical Commentary.* Histories, Practices, Theory. 2002. ISBN 90 04 12153 6
233. JONGMAN, W. & M. KLEIJWEGT (eds.). *After the Past.* Essays in Ancient History in Honour of H.W. Pleket. 2002. ISBN 90 04 12816 6
234. GORMAN, V.B. & E.W. ROBINSON (eds.). *Oikistes.* Studies in Constitutions, Colonies, and Military Power in the Ancient World. Offered in Honor of A.J. Graham. 2002. ISBN 90 04 12579 5
235. HARDER, A., R. REGTUIT, P. STORK & G. WAKKER (eds.). *Noch einmal zu....* Kleine Schriften von Stefan Radt zu seinem 75. Geburtstag. 2002. ISBN 90 04 12794 1
236. ADRADOS, F.R. *History of the Graeco-Latin Fable.* Volume Three: Inventory and Documentation of the Graeco-Latin Fable. 2002. ISBN 90 04 11891 8
237. SCHADE, G. *Stesichoros.* Papyrus Oxyrhynchus 2359, 3876, 2619, 2803. 2003. ISBN 90 04 12832 8
238. ROSEN, R.M. & I. SLUITER (eds.) *Andreia.* Studies in Manliness and Courage in Classical Antiquity. 2003. ISBN 90 04 11995 7
239. GRAINGER, J.D. *The Roman War of Antiochos the Great.* 2002. ISBN 90 04 12840 9
240. KOVACS, D. *Euripidea Tertia.* 2003. ISBN 90 04 12977 4
241. PANAYOTAKIS, S., M. ZIMMERMAN & W. KEULEN (eds.). *The Ancient Novel and Beyond.* 2003. ISBN 90 04 12999 5

242. ZACHARIA, K. C*onverging Truths.* Euripides' *Ion* and the Athenian Quest for Self-Definition. 2003. ISBN 90 0413000 4
243. ALMEIDA, J.A. *Justice as an Aspect of the Polis Idea in Solon's Political Poems.* 2003. ISBN 90 04 13002 0
244. HORSFALL, N. *Virgil,* Aeneid *11.* A Commentary. 2003. ISBN 90 04 12934 0
245. VON ALBRECHT, M. *Cicero's Style.* A Synopsis. Followed by Selected Analytic Studies. 2003. ISBN 90 04 12961 8
246. LOMAS, K. *Greek Identity in the Western Mediterranean.* Papers in Honour of Brian Shefton. 2004. ISBN 90 04 13300 3
247. SCHENKEVELD, D.M. *A Rhetorical Grammar.* C. Iullus Romanus, Introduction to the Liber de Adverbio. 2004. ISBN 90 04 133662 2
248. MACKIE, C.J. *Oral Performance and its Context.* 2004. ISBN 90 04 13680 0
249. RADICKE, J. *Lucans Poetische Technik.* 2004. ISBN 90 04 13745 9
250. DE BLOIS, L., J. BONS, T. KESSELS & D.M. SCHENKEVELD (eds.). *The Statesman in Plutarch's Works.* Volume I: Plutarch's Statesman and his Aftermath: Political, Philosophical, and Literary Aspects. ISBN 90 04 13795 5. Volume II: The Statesman in Plutarch's Greek and Roman *Lives.* 2005. ISBN 90 04 13808 0
251. GREEN, S.J. *Ovid,* Fasti *1.* A Commentary. 2004. ISBN 90 04 13985 0
252. VON ALBRECHT, M. *Wort und Wandlung.* 2004. ISBN 90 04 13988 5
253. KORTEKAAS, G.A.A. *The Story of Apollonius, King of Tyre.* A Study of Its Greek Origin and an Edition of the Two Oldest Latin Recensions. 2004. ISBN 90 04 13923 0
254. SLUITER, I. & R.M. ROSEN (eds.). *Free Speech in Classical Antiquity.* 2004. ISBN 90 04 13925 7
255. STODDARD, K. *The Narrative Voice in the* Theogony *of Hesiod.* 2004. ISBN 90 04 14002 6
256. FITCH, J.G. *Annaeana Tragica.* Notes on the Text of Seneca's Tragedies. 2004. ISBN 90 04 14003 4
257. DE JONG, I.J.F., R. NÜNLIST & A. BOWIE (eds.). *Narrators, Narratees, and Narratives in Ancient Greek Literature.* Studies in Ancient Greek Narrative, Volume One. 2004. ISBN 90 04 13927 3
258. VAN TRESS, H. *Poetic Memory.* Allusion in the Poetry of Callimachus and the *Metamorphoses* of Ovid. 2004. ISBN 90 04 14157 X
259. RADEMAKER, A. Sophrosyne *and the Rhetoric of Self-Restraint.* Polysemy & Persuasive Use of an Ancient Greek Value Term. 2005. ISBN 90 04 14251 7
260. BUIJS, M. *Clause Combining in Ancient Greek Narrative Discourse.* The Distribution of Subclauses and Participial Clauses in Xenophon's *Hellenica* and *Anabasis.* 2005. ISBN 90 04 14250 9
261. ENENKEL, K.A.E. & I.L. PFEIJFFER (eds.). *The Manipulative Mode.* Political Propaganda in Antiquity: A Collection of Case Studies. 2005. ISBN 90 04 14291 6
262. KLEYWEGT, A.J. *Valerius Flaccus,* Argonautica, *Book I.* A Commentary. 2005. ISBN 90 04 13924 9
263. MURGATROYD, P. *Mythical and Legendary Narrative in Ovid's* Fasti. 2005. ISBN 90 04 14320 3
264. WALLINGA, H.T. *Xerxes' Greek Adventure.* The Naval Perspective. 2005. ISBN 90 04 14140 5